

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 16, 1916.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

Brig. Gen. John J. Pershing to be major general.
Col. Eben Swift, General Staff Corps (Cavalry), to be brigadier general.
Col. Francis H. French, General Staff Corps (Infantry), to be brigadier general.
Col. Edwin St. J. Greble, Sixth Field Artillery, to be brigadier general.
Col. Charles G. Treat, General Staff Corps (Field Artillery), to be brigadier general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, December 16, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We would approach Thee, Eternal God, in the spirit of Him who taught us to pray, Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy Name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth as it is done in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found enrolled bill and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8816. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to cause the sailing vessel *Golden Gate* to be registered as a vessel of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster of Springfield, Ill., with a special canceling die for the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Federal Union.

The SPEAKER. With the consent of the House the Chair desires to make a short statement about these bills reported from the Committee on Enrolled Bills. It will be remembered that early in this session the House passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker and the President of the Senate, or the Vice President as the case might be, to sign two bills which were passed at the last session, but not passed in time to be signed. The Senate indefinitely postponed that resolution. The Chair signed these bills, and the Chair has laid them before the House because he believes the Speaker, the Vice President, or the President of the Senate pro tempore have as much right to sign these bills as any other bill. There is nothing anywhere the Chair has been able to find that fixes any time when the Speaker, the Vice President, or the President of the Senate pro tempore shall sign bills. The Chair has laid them before the House with that statement because he believes the Chair had the right to sign, resolution or no resolution, and that the resolution is superfluous.

IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 10384, to agree to the conference asked for by the Senate—the Senate has already appointed conferees—

Mr. MANN. To disagree to the Senate amendments.

Mr. BURNETT. To disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the immigration bill, to disagree to all Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if the conferees on the part of the House, before agreeing to Senate amendment 5, page 7, striking out the words "Hindus and persons who can not become eligible under existing law to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports, or by existing treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into," will give the House an opportunity for a separate vote?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would not like to make an agreement of that kind in advance of the action of the conferees. I would ask the gentleman not to make that request.

Mr. RAKER. The only suggestion I make is, that would be the only opportunity, it seems to me, the House has to pass on this amendment of the Senate striking out in regard to the exclusion of Hindus and of persons who can not become eligible, under existing laws, citizens of the United States by naturalization. I think the House ought to have opportunity to fully act on that, if the Senate conferees insist on their amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. I would not want to agree in advance to anything of that kind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object further—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has been answered.

Mr. RAKER. I know, but not quite fully. I understand the conferees of the House will insist upon the House bill in reference to that feature?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURNETT, Mr. SABATH, and Mr. HAYES.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 611. An act for the erection of a monument to the memory of Matthew Fontaine Maury, of Virginia; and

S. 1428. An act to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900.

LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND EXECUTIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18542, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18542, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 118 for the purpose of offering an amendment which will not consume any time. I ran my legs off endeavoring to get over here yesterday and missed it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to return to page 118 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment reported first.

Mr. FERRIS. I will state it. On page 118, lines 13 and 14, strike out "editorial assistant, \$2,000," and insert "chief of division of district offices, \$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 118, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "editorial assistant, \$2,000," and insert "chief of division of district offices, \$2,500."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, what is the reason for it?

Mr. FERRIS. The reason is simply this. The gentleman who holds the place now is Mr. Dan Casey. He is designated as the

editorial assistant, and while he edits the Daily Consular and Trade Reports he is also the chief of the Division of District Offices in the Foreign and Domestic Bureau. Mr. Casey is an expert in his line. He is a civil-service man and has been employed in the bureau ever since its creation by Congress. Even before that he entered the service about the time of the establishment of the Bureau of Manufactures, the functions of which were later absorbed by the Foreign and Domestic Commerce Bureau. His services cover a period of at least eight or nine years, and, moreover, in addition to the actual experience he has had in this work during this period, he has made a special study along foreign and domestic commerce lines. The \$2,000 per annum that he gets is not sufficient pay for the services he performs. Others, perhaps not as well qualified as Mr. Casey, have left the bureau to accept positions offered them by private concerns, and these concerns have been glad to avail themselves of the services of these men, and at salaries two or three times as much as they were paid in the Government service. If we are to retain men of extraordinary capacity and ability in the Government service, we ought to at least pay them what they are worth. The justification for it is this:

The work is an important feature in the bureau and is handled by a member of the regular bureau staff. There are eight district offices, with 32 employees, and eight "cooperative" offices, established in chambers of commerce in large cities. The agents in charge are specialists in foreign commerce, selected as a result of a civil-service examination. In a comparatively short time these offices have become the centers for foreign-trade information where they are located. They enable the bureau to keep in close touch with business men.

The work of this division chief requires familiarity with all phases of the bureau's work. Important questions must be handled with sound judgment. By being in immediate contact with the business men the bureau is able to make all its work more effective. The chief of this division must be able to sense the opportunity for new and creative work and for the extension of existing facilities of the bureau. The position requires initiative and constructive ability. It is believed that \$3,500 is little enough to pay for work of this grade.

Just one word more—

Mr. GOOD. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he intends to make a point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; I intend to make a point of order against the amendment, which is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Then I object.

Mr. FERRIS. Does the gentleman from Iowa object?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman had not finished his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa objects, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Standards: Director, \$6,000; physicists—chief \$4,800, 1 qualified in optics \$3,600, 2 at \$3,600 each, 1, \$3,000; associate physicists—3 at \$2,700 each, 4 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,200 each, 6 at \$2,000 each; assistant physicists—9 at \$1,800 each, 11 at \$1,600 each, 14 at \$1,400 each; chemists—chief, \$4,800; 1, \$3,500; 1, \$3,000; associate chemists—3 at \$2,700 each; 2 at \$2,500 each; 1, \$2,200; 4 at \$2,000 each; assistant chemists—4 at \$1,800 each, 4 at \$1,600 each, 6 at \$1,400 each; physical chemist, \$1,800; laboratory assistants—19 at \$1,200 each, 14 at \$1,000 each, 14 at \$900 each; laboratory helpers—2 at \$840 each, 3 at \$720 each, 3 at \$600 each; aids—11 at \$720 each, 7 at \$600 each; 12 laboratory apprentices, at \$540 each; secretary, \$2,200; storekeeper, \$1,000; librarian, \$1,600; clerks—1 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 6 of class 1, five at \$1,000 each, 5 at \$900 each, 2 at \$720 each; telephone operator, \$720; office apprentices—2 at \$540 each, 2 at \$480 each, 3 at \$360 each; elevator boys—1, \$480; 3 at \$360 each; mechanics—chief, \$1,800; 1, \$1,600; 1, \$1,500; 1, \$1,400; 3 at \$1,200 each; 4 at \$1,000 each; 1, \$900; shop apprentices—1, \$540; 2 at \$480 each; 5 watchmen; skilled woodworkers—1, \$1,200; 1, \$1,000; 1, \$840; skilled laborers—6 at \$720 each; draftsman, \$1,200; photographer, \$1,200; packer, \$840; messenger; assistant messenger; superintendent of mechanical plant, \$2,500; assistant engineers—1, \$1,600; 1, \$1,400; 2 at \$1,200 each; 1, \$1,000; 1, \$900; pipefitter, \$1,000; 5 firemen; glass blower, \$1,600; glassworker, \$1,600; electricians—1, \$1,200; 1, \$900; foreman of janitors and laborers, \$840; 12 laborers; janitors—3 at \$660 each; 1, \$600; 2 female laborers, at \$360 each; in all, \$348,900.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 125, in line 5, after the figures "\$600," strike out "two" and insert "four."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the Clerk read that amendment again. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, my reason for proposing this amendment is the fact that these women in this particular bureau are working eight hours a day at \$360 a year, and in

some departments of the Government the charwomen are being paid \$300 for working three and four hours a day. I find that down in the Interior Department these female laborers at \$400 a year work four hours a day, while these women in the Bureau of Standards work eight hours a day. And the reason the bureau gives is that they have not enough of them to do the work in four hours.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if there is any class of people laboring in the departments of this Government who work eight hours a day who should be given a liberal and decent wage, it is those women who spend their time in cleaning up the office buildings. I do not propose to offer an amendment to raise their salaries, because if I did a point of order would be made. I believe that, when the price of foodstuffs and everything else has increased as it has, if a woman is to receive \$360 a year she ought to have the time to work at something else in order to make a living, and if we add these two female laborers these women will have time to work in other places also. I do not believe that even the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] thinks that a woman can live on \$360 a year even if she has no family to support.

I made the statement a few days ago in speaking about the women laborers in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing that they work eight hours a day down there at \$400 a year. I stated that on the information of the assistant director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. This morning I talked with the director, and he told me that the statement was correct, that those women do work eight hours a day there at \$400 a year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with a country as wealthy and as prosperous as this country is, with the Government taking in such tremendous revenues as this Government is taking in at the present time, with increases of appropriations being made for every department of the Government for almost every purpose, it seems to me that it can ill-afford to continue a system of paying wages to women that makes it impossible for them to live, women working eight hours a day for \$360 a year, as is the case in this particular instance. For that reason I believe the committee ought not to oppose this amendment but rather accept it as a matter of justice to these women.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman realizes that there are 30,000 employees in the District of Columbia who work only seven hours or less a day?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. And that it costs the taxpayers approximately \$5,000,000 a year because of that short day's work. Is the gentleman in favor of a standard of eight hours a day?

Mr. DILL. If the wage is commensurate with the extra hours; yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Assuming it is, is the gentleman in favor of it, then?

Mr. DILL. I will say to the gentleman this: I think if the Government employees did work eight hours a day they would be in much better position to demand an increase of wages, but what I object to is that the Government employees who do work eight hours a day get the poorest wages in the Government service. Take these laborers at \$300 and \$360 and \$400 a year, and they are working eight hours a day, every one of them. Yet these clerks that work seven hours, as the gentleman from Missouri says, are getting wages of from \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year. I have not in these discussions on the subject of wages at any time proposed to raise the wage of any employee who is getting more than \$900. I have been talking repeatedly for the people who were not making enough money to live on. It is a fact that you can not take care of yourself properly on even \$600 a year and have any decent standard of living at all, much less on \$360 per year. Certainly, this Government ought to be the last government in the world to pay its employees as ridiculously low wages as \$360 or \$480 or \$600 a year for their work. I care not what they do. If the Government uses their time, it should pay them decent wages for that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has repeatedly stated that these female laborers work eight hours a day. I do not know from what source the gentleman gets his information. The committee has had before it the Director of the Bureau of Standards and other officials of the bureau and of the department. The gentleman evidently gets his information from some private source with reference to these female laborers. I dare say that if he would ask them they would tell him possibly that they were doing more work than any of the laborers out there at the Bureau of Standards. But the fact is that Dr. Stratton, whom we all know as one of the most useful,

able, and splendid gentlemen in the service of the Government of the United States, a man entirely humane and a man who has never shown any hesitation—neither he nor the Secretary of Commerce—to come before the committee and recommend increases of salary when he thought it proper—I say the fact is that Dr. Stratton has not asked for any increased salary for these female laborers, nor has he asked that his force of female laborers be increased from two to four.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DILL. In answer to the gentleman's question as to where I received the information, I will say to him that I procured it from the secretary of the Director of the Bureau of Standards, Mr. Stratton himself not being in this morning. I asked him particularly in order not to make any mistake, and I explained to him that I had been informed that these women worked eight hours a day, and wanted to know if I had been correctly informed. I also called up Mr. Ralph, Chief of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and he tells me that these women at his bureau work eight hours a day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Director of the Bureau of Standards estimated for increases of salary for various members of his force, but he did not ask for any increase with reference to these female laborers, evidently believing that they were receiving the entire amount justified by the services they performed.

Now, the gentleman will note from this appropriation that the Bureau of Standards has 12 laborers and also a foreman of laborers. As to these female laborers, I do not know how many hours they work, but they do very light work, such as cleaning and dusting. It is lighter and the hours not so long as those required of servants in the households of Washington, where the wages paid are much less than that paid to these employees. The amendment of the gentleman does not propose to relieve these female laborers in any way. He simply proposes to increase the force there and to put two more female laborers in the service of the Government at the same price of \$360; and the gentleman, instead of relieving the situation from his own point of view, is simply increasing what he calls an injustice that is being done by this Government to some classes of its employees by adding two more at the same standard of wages.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DILL. Does the gentleman believe that a woman who works eight hours a day can live on \$360 a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not for a moment concede, Mr. Chairman, that these female laborers work eight hours a day. I do not know how many hours a day they work, but, I repeat, they do a very light character of work, and the Director of the Bureau of Standards, who is in charge of that work, has not asked that they be given one dollar more than they have been given for the current year or than they were given last year.

Now, I assume that the Director of the Bureau of Standards knows a great deal more about what they are really worth than does the gentleman from Washington or myself or any other Member of this House, because he is there and he knows the class of work they perform, and I insist that we ought not to vote money out of the Treasury and give him additional female laborers when he does not need them and does not ask for them. We ought at least to consult with him as to whether or not their services are needed. I repeat, the amendment of the gentleman from Washington does not propose to relieve, and will not relieve, these female laborers in any sense of the word. It simply proposes to put two useless and unnecessary employees out there at the same salary as those now performing the work, and who are willing and content to do the entire work required of this class of laborers at the salaries they are now receiving.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL].

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. DILL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, yeas 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of buildings in the District of Columbia, \$60,500.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioners of conciliation: To enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 8 of the act creating the Department of Labor, and to appoint commissioners of conciliation, for per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4 pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, and traveling expenses, including an executive clerk at \$2,000 in the District of Columbia, \$75,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDWELL. I do so for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that in the preceding paragraph the Assistant Secretary of Labor gets \$5,000, and the private secretary of the Assistant Secretary gets \$2,100.

Now, every Member of this House does more work than the Assistant Secretary and because of his ability and the character of the work he does is paid \$7,500. He has only one clerk, and that one gets only \$1,500.

Now, then, in addition to that, that clerk is doing all the work required of him by his principal, and has no help whatever. Yet the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor is provided with a clerk at \$2,100. So that when we ask here that our clerks be paid \$2,000 a year and that we be supplied with a stenographer to be paid \$75 a month during the session of Congress, we are not asking for as much as is given to the Assistant Secretary of this department of the Government, and under the circumstances I think it is only fair that this House should consider those things when it is considering the amendment on the roll call.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Labor Statistics: Commissioner, \$5,000; chief statistician, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, \$3,000; 4 statistical experts, at \$2,000 each; employees—1 \$2,760, 1 \$2,520, 3 at \$2,280 each, 1 \$1,800, 6 at \$1,600 each, 7 at \$1,400 each, 2 at \$1,200 each; special agents—4 at \$1,800 each, 6 at \$1,600 each, 8 at \$1,400 each, 4 at \$1,200 each; clerks—7 of class 4, 6 of class 3, 8 of class 2, 14 of class 1, 9 at \$1,000 each; 2 copyists; 2 assistant messengers; 2 laborers; in all, \$148,280.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. While we are on the subject of labor and labor statistics, I want to ask the member of the committee in charge of the bill [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee] whether any provision has yet been made to meet the wages of workmen in the various mints of the United States, as requested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; there were increases made of the lump sum for wages of labor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am referring to a deficiency appropriation that has been asked for to cover the wages of the men employed in various mints, in excess of previous appropriations, because of the heavy demand for coinage.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is a matter that will be taken care of, if taken care of at all, in another bill, and not in this bill; but I will say to the gentleman that this bill takes into consideration the alleged deficiencies for this year, and has made a substantial increase in the lump-sum appropriation for the wages of workmen in the mints during the fiscal year 1918.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have in my hand a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Newton, dated December 2, in which he states that there is a deficiency in appropriations for wages and contingent expenses, and that so far as the mint at Philadelphia is concerned he may be forced to suspend operations at that institution. That situation, I understand, is aggravated since December 2. Evidently the Director of the Mint is compelled to make contracts or to incur indebtedness in excess of appropriations already made, unless the required amount is appropriated as a deficiency appropriation, and I assume that for him to be compelled to do that would be a very serious matter.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As the gentleman well knows, that matter is taken care of in the deficiency bill and not in this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman representing the committee state whether any provision has been made for these deficiencies, in order that the work may continue and the wages be paid?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not being a member of the subcommittee on deficiencies, I am unable to give the gentleman that information.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that men have been employed at the Denver Mint, and at San Francisco, who are working now without any authorization of Congress?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I have no information of that kind. The hearings disclosed that there would be a possible deficit in the sum provided for the wages of workmen in these various mints, but as to the exact amount, or how that deficiency arises, of course, I do not know. It is not a matter of inquiry for this bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would this question come before the gentleman's subcommittee? A letter dated December 5 from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury states that there is now a deficit of \$107,500 in the matter of wages due to workmen employed in the various mints, and that unless an appropriation is made to meet those wages there is danger of closing down.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state that this bill carries a considerable increase over the sums heretofore allowed for wages of workmen in these mints.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But does it carry anything to meet the deficiency referred to in the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Newton, dated December 2, in which he says:

The depletion of these appropriations is due to the unprecedented demand for coinage, the extraordinary volume of deposits of foreign gold, and the marked rise in all supplies used in the handling of bullion and the execution of coinage.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it does not, for under the rules of the House a deficiency would not be in order on this bill. That is a matter for the deficiency bill, and will doubtless come up later.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman whether a deficiency bill is contemplated that will provide for such deficiencies as are herein reported by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of course, the gentleman knows that I am not in a position to speak with authority upon that matter, but the gentleman knows that deficiency bills are reported every session of Congress, and undoubtedly if there are deficiencies in any of the departments of the Government a bill will be reported making the proper allowance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As to the suggestion that the mints may close down, has the gentleman any information?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: On page 132, line 20, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "eight."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves a point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is to provide the additional clerks asked for by the Department of Labor, so that it may do its work more expeditiously and for the greater benefit of the people whom that department was created to serve. I am informed that the difficulty about the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is that that bureau has not sufficient help to compile and prepare its report in time to get it before the readers while it is fresh. In other words, the field men go out and search for the necessary information, but after that is obtained there is not a sufficient force to compile it and prepare it for printing, until it becomes stale, when it is not of the value that it would be if it could be received by the people it is supposed to benefit at the time they should receive it.

I believe we are now considering bills in the name of preparedness, for the expenditure of some seven or eight hundred million dollars. I believe we all agree that there is no better preparedness than to preserve the physical and mental resources of our citizenship. This research work, the securing of information as to industrial conditions, accidents and the remedy therefor, hygienic conditions, and so forth, is necessary in order that we may be able to preserve the physical and mental resources of the citizenship of this country. The amount that is asked for that purpose is insignificant compared to what Con-

gress has expended and proposes to expend for preparedness in the building of battleships, yet we are not able to get men enough to man them to-day. Therefore I submit that this amendment, with others that I am prepared to offer, should be accepted by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee insist on his point of order, or withdraw it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My point of order is that these statistical experts are not authorized by law, and I submit that the burden is on the gentleman to furnish the Chair with the law authorizing the amendment, or making it in order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the position taken by the gentleman from Tennessee, it seems to me, is erroneous, for the reason that no matter what you call these employees, whether statistical expert clerks, or what not, they are employed to do the work that the Bureau of Labor statistics was authorized to do by law. It seems to me that it would be a very weak and poorly drawn law that would provide for a bureau or department to do certain kinds of work and then not provide for the procurement of experts or other employees sufficient to do the work in an efficient and expeditious manner. If that is the only ground that the gentleman has for his point of order, it seems to me that it is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee, Does the act creating the bureau provide for the number of statistical experts?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It did not specify the number; it did not authorize any experts. It provided for a chief clerk and clerical assistance, but there was no authorization in the act for a statistical expert. For that reason four statistical experts were provided for by law by reason of the passage of the last appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this increase differs from an increase of clerks or laborers or assistant messengers or charwomen. It is to increase the official force of the bureau. The four experts that are carried are made in order by a provision in the legislative bill of last year to this effect:

The officers and employees of the United States whose salaries are herein provided for are established and continued from year to year to the extent they shall be appropriated for by Congress.

If it had not been for that amendment to the legislative act of last year, these statistical experts would have been subject to a point of order, but all four were authorized by this very provision. Four experts have been authorized, and there is no warrant of law that will provide for an additional number of those officials. You might as well say that if we provided for one Secretary of Labor you could provide for two when there was only one authorized. There have been four experts authorized and not eight.

The CHAIRMAN. Are these experts under the general civil-service law or are they specially provided for by the act?

Mr. STAFFORD. I presume they are civil-service employees, but they are those only provided for by this act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the only authority for statistical experts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics is a provision in the current legislative act providing for four such places. There is no authority in the organic act of the Labor Department, nor is there any authority or provision in the Revised Statutes under which it is in order to increase the number of clerks in the classified service of the various departments. These employees are established to the number of four by reason of the provision contained in the current legislative bill, which establishes to the number and extent and character the places provided for in that act. Any increase in compensation, any increase in number, is contrary to the number established by law and not in order in the bill under the rules of the House.

The Chair will recall that for a number of years there was considerable difficulty encountered in the consideration of the legislative bill, because a good many positions had been from time to time provided on appropriation bills, and in many instances the compensation increased above that fixed in the statute creating the place.

That situation resulted on several occasions in the legislative bill being practically emasculated by points of order being interposed. It was to correct that condition that there was inserted two years ago for the first time a provision in the legislative bill which established at the compensation and to the number the positions carried in the legislative act. That was repeated in the current law, so that every position provided for in the current legislative act is established by law to the number provided

and at the compensation provided. The only authority for statistical experts in the Bureau of Labor is in the current legislative act, and that establishes four statistical experts in the Bureau of Labor at a compensation of \$2,000 a year. There is no authority for additional ones. Any proposal to increase the number is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The law provides for four statistical experts. The amendment proposing to increase it to eight changes existing law, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: On page 132, line 21, strike out the word "one" after the comma following the figures 2,760, and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the same ground, that it is not authorized by law; that the increase is not authorized by law, and that the law fixes the number which the amendment seeks to increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I understand the committee has already increased the number of employees in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The present provision provides for an increase, and my amendment provides for a further increase. I do not understand what law there is to prohibit Congress that created the department from providing a sufficient number of employees or experts to do the work in an efficient manner. I have never thought of this being attacked on the point of order, and therefore have not looked up the precedents in regard to it. I have nothing further to say about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. While it is thoroughly competent ordinarily for the House to pass such legislation as it sees fit increasing the clerical force of any of the departments, yet the House has adopted a rule for its guidance which provides that in considering appropriation bills no amendment shall be in order that legislates; under the law the number of special employees for the Department of Labor are numbered, and this amendment seeks to enlarge that number by adding an additional clerk of the special class. Therefore it changes existing law, and in the opinion of the Chair is not in order upon an appropriation bill. The Chair, consequently, must sustain the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 132, line 25, strike out the word "seven" and insert the word "nine."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this additional clerk hire is necessary for the purpose of doing the work efficiently in the Department of Labor, in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It seems that it is very difficult to be able to provide for sufficient assistance to do that work as it should be done. I do not know that it is necessary for me to take up the time of the House in making any additional statement in regard to the matter, further than to say that I am convinced that this amendment as well as all of the others is very important, because they tend to secure information which will permit us to properly legislate, and not only that, but permit those who are in charge of the industries of the country to improve the conditions of the working people of the country. I therefore urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Labor Statistics now has 72 persons employed in it. It carries an appropriation of \$137,880. The committee allowed 7 additional clerks, 2 of them of class 4, 1 at \$1,600, 2 clerks of class 2, and 2 clerks of class 1, making a total of 7 allowed to this particular bureau, which it was believed by the committee would be sufficient to enable it to keep up with its work and keep the work current. That is a considerable increase given to this bureau, and I think I may say that possibly without exception the committee has been more liberal with the Department of Labor and with this bureau than with any other department in the Government in so far as this particular bill is concerned. I submit that having allowed two additional clerks of class 4 and five clerks at salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$1,600 a year, that that is all that Congress ought to allow, and I therefore ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois) there were—ayes 22, noes 29.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 132, line 25, strike out the word "six" and insert the word "nine."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is for additional assistance to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is very much needed to do the work there in an expeditious manner.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in this Bureau of Labor Statistics there are at present in the clerical force, from \$1,800 down to \$1,000, 37 clerks. The committee was more than liberal in providing additional places and opportunities for promotion in this bureau. We increased their force by seven, but we did not increase their force by seven in the lower grade of clerks of \$1,000 and \$1,200 a year. We gave them two additional clerks in the \$1,800 grade, one in the \$1,600 grade, two in the \$1,400 grade, and two in the \$1,200 grade. Those increases will provide for 17 promotions altogether, from \$1,000 up. The committee recognized the principle that it has followed throughout the bill of providing additional places in the higher grades, so that the chiefs of the bureaus could give the additional allowances in salaries to efficient clerks whom they would promote from lower positions. Never before in the history of this bill, so far as my memory serves me, has the committee been so liberal in providing additional places in the \$1,800 and \$1,600 and \$1,400 and \$1,200 grades. More than 400 places are provided, which will enable the promotion of deserving clerks. The committee was prompted in doing that by reason of the increase in the cost of living. We realized that there was some need for raising the pay on account of the increased cost of living, which is impinging upon all of the clerks in the departments. There were many of us in the committee who believed that the first consideration should be given to those receiving \$1,000 and under, but in these higher grade positions the committee has recognized the fact that there is need of providing for an increase in the salaries, and we have left it to the heads of the departments, as only a committee can do in the administration of clerical force, to determine where merit shall be recognized and the salaries increased. In addition to that, the committee has brought in the recommendation to provide every one from \$1,800 to \$1,200 with a 5 per cent horizontal increase bonus of pay for one year. No one can criticize the action of the committee in the policy that has been pursued, not only with this bureau, but with all bureaus, and having granted them seven additional clerks in this bureau is there anyone who can say that we were not liberal?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I fear that there is a failure to appreciate the importance of the work of the Department of Labor, and particularly of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Department of Labor is one of the most important departments. There is not the slightest doubt but that the next Congresses will be concerned with labor legislation to a greater extent than any other kind of legislation. With the growing intelligence of the great industrial masses the Congress of the United States will be compelled to take up one labor measure after another. The preparation and systematizing of knowledge on all subjects relating to labor must precede intelligent legislation. The Bureau of Labor Statistics asks for an increased appropriation so that it may continue the study of collective bargaining, so that it may improve the method of collating industrial accident statistics, and make a study of the condition of labor in the coal-mining industry. Take the list of contemplated publications. Additional publications in course of preparation at the end of the fiscal year include the following: Wholesale prices; retail prices; wages and hours of labor in the cotton, woolen, boot and shoe, lumber, and iron and steel industries, and special studies of occupations and processes in these industries; studies of the productivity of labor by occupations in the lumber industry, the boot and shoe industry, and the cotton and woolen industries; union scale of wages; trade schools for girls in Massachusetts; workmen's compensation laws and their administration; accidents and accident prevention in the machine, building, and iron and steel industries; causes of death in cotton-mill occupations; causes of death in industrial employment, as shown by experience of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; hygiene of the printing trades; mortality from consumption in dusty trades; labor laws and court decisions; administration of labor laws in various States; standards of safety and hygiene in industry required by law or regulation in the different States; foreign labor legislation; wages and working conditions of street railway labor in the United States; profit sharing; what establishment bureaus of employment are doing to reduce the labor turnover and increase regularity of employment; employers' welfare work; work of State and municipal employment bu-

reus; sick-benefit funds of trade-unions and of establishments; proceedings of annual meetings of international associations of industrial accident boards and commissions and of the American Association of Public Employment Offices; effect of workmen's compensation laws in connection with fatal industrial accidents in minimizing the necessity of the industrial employment of women and children; coal-mine labor legislation in Pennsylvania; protection of the health of workers engaged in the manufacture of high explosives and of coal-tar dyes; housing of working people by employers in the United States; report of the President's board for standardization of first-aid methods; handbook of occupational diseases; purposes and work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; vocational experience by young people in Boston; a study of the work of State boards of arbitration and conciliation; and the beginning of a series of reports on the history of American trade-unions.

The work of the bureau should not be thwarted. Congress should be more liberal in appropriating funds for the study of those vital problems, so that we may all know more about those things than we know now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem at not exceeding \$4 in lieu of subsistence, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, of special agents and employees and for their transportation; experts and temporary assistance for field service outside of the District of Columbia, to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$8 per day; temporary statistical clerks and stenographers in the District of Columbia, to be selected from civil-service registers and to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$100 per month, the same person to be employed for not more than six consecutive months, the total expenditure for such temporary clerical assistance in the District of Columbia not to exceed \$6,000; traveling expenses of officers and employees, purchase of reports and materials for reports and bulletins of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and for subvention to "International Association for Labour Legislation," and necessary expenses connected with representation of the United States Government therein, \$65,090.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The word "subvention" is used here in line 17, page 133. It is a new word in legislation of this kind. Evidently it means a direct appropriation in connection with some convention of the "International Association for Labour Legislation." Is that what it means?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. So I understand. It is a permanent appropriation which the United States Government contributes every year.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Have we been sending delegates to this convention heretofore?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much money would be included in this subvention?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. One thousand two hundred and fifty dollars.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And that is all. We send delegates—appointed by whom?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not able to inform the gentleman. This \$1,250 represents expenses in connection with this association.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, "subvention to International Association for Labour Legislation" is covered in the aggregate by an appropriation of \$64,090. My inquiry was as to how much the subvention would amount to, and I should also like to know who appoints the representatives of the United States to this international association?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The expense would amount, as estimated, to \$1,250—not exceeding that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No salaries?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No salaries. My understanding of the matter of appointment is that the Department of Labor makes the appointments, but I am not very sure about that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it an annual convention?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is an annual convention; yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the convention is held annually?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In this country or in Europe?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In this country exclusively?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is international; I do not think it is necessarily held in this country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know where it meets?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I can not say to the gentleman where it meets, I am frank to say. It has headquarters in Switzerland. It is an organization for the purpose of comparing and unifying labor legislation of the world.

Mr. SISSON. I will state that my information about this matter is not extensive except that the various labor organizations of the country hold a convention. Just how long this has been organized I can not tell the gentleman, but it perhaps antedates the organization of the Department of Labor here in Washington; and the delegates of these labor organizations meet and the Department of Labor sends, as I am informed, a representative to attend that convention, which will be called, as they call other labor conventions, for the purpose of discussing throughout the world questions of legislation affecting labor.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the American Federation of Labor represented at that convention?

Mr. SISSON. I think not only that, but I think all labor organizations who are members of this association send delegates there, but just how many labor organizations belong to it I am not informed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman sure that the Secretary of Labor appoints delegates on behalf of the United States to attend this convention?

Mr. SISSON. I think he selects somebody out of the Department of Labor. I do not know exactly, but I understand he will select some representative from the Department of Labor to attend this convention, not as a delegate as I understand it, but merely to attend the convention for the purpose of securing information as to what is going on.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And to report back to the Government of the United States?

Mr. SISSON. And to report back to the Secretary of the Department of Labor, as I understand. In other words, that keeps him informed about the labor conditions that are being discussed by the labor organizations throughout the country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that this is an official matter?

Mr. SISSON. It is official only in that the Congress appropriates this money so that the Department of Labor may have representation at such a meeting.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, it is an official representation?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; I understand that it is.

The Clerk read as follows:

For books, periodicals, and newspapers for the library the sum of \$100 may be expended for newspapers for the purpose of procuring strike data, \$1,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I desire, Mr. Chairman, to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 133, after line 23, insert the following item:

"Collective bargaining: To enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to undertake a study of collective bargaining in the more important industries, and for the employment of suitable persons to conduct such study and for the needed clerical assistants, whether within or outside of the District of Columbia, such persons to be selected in accordance with civil-service regulations, \$19,000."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment. It is new legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I reserve it.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. While I did not hope to be able to secure a withdrawal of the point of order, I wish to say that those of us who have studied industrial questions know something about the great cost of industrial warfare. An investigation of this sort might lead a way to avoid many of those industrial troubles and it would be a great saving to the working people of the country and to the manufacturers of the country. It is a work of great importance to do anything that will tend to bring about peace and good will in the industrial world. It is costing the people of the country entirely too much. Perhaps if there was some great industrial war threatened, where it would tie up the industries of the country and make it a hardship upon the consumers to secure the necessities of life, throw thousands or hundreds of thousands of men out of work, without hesitation and unanimously we would spend one, two, three, or four, or five hundred thousand dollars to bring it to the proper adjustment.

This is a small amount. It might find a way to avoid these troubles, which is much better than curing the disease after it has been contracted. It is so important, from my point of view, that I am certain if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] could see its importance as I do, he would withdraw the point of order and permit this amendment to be adopted.

Mr. COX. What is meant by the phrase, "collective bargaining"? I do not know.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Well, collective bargaining is where organizations of labor bargain with their employers.

Mr. COX. That is, bargaining with employers for price?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Or wages, or to adjust any differences that might arise, or to secure better conditions by higher wages or other things that labor is seeking to secure to improve its condition. Collective bargaining is the organizations bargaining with their employers for a purpose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 132, after line 23, insert the following item:

"Condition of labor in coal-mining industry: To enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct an investigation of wages, hours, and conditions of labor in the coal-mining industry and to make an industrial survey of that industry, and for the employment of suitable persons to make such investigation, and for needed clerical assistants whether within or outside the District of Columbia, such persons to be selected in accordance with civil-service regulations, \$25,000."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman desire me to reserve the point of order? If so, I will do so in order that the gentleman may discuss his amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] may wish to make some observations on this, as he is familiar with the coal-mining industry, and I will be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I trust the distinguished gentleman who is representing the committee at this time will be merciful in this particular instance and not press the point of order.

This amendment authorizes a thorough study of wages, hours, conditions of labor, including an industrial survey of coal mining in the United States. It reads as follows:

To enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct an investigation of wages, hours, and conditions of labor in the coal-mining industry and to make an industrial survey of that industry, and for the employment of suitable persons to make such investigation, and for needed clerical assistance whether within or outside of the District of Columbia, such persons to be selected in accordance with civil-service regulations, \$25,000.

For three years every effort has been made to include an investigation of the coal-mining industry in the regular work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. After trimming other wages work of the bureau to a minimum it was found to be still impossible to cover coal mining, and therefore Congress is asked to assist to the extent of \$25,000. This would not be a continuing item; the work would be done in the fiscal year and no request for reenactment of this appropriating clause would be submitted.

There has never been a survey of earnings and general labor conditions in the coal fields of the United States. Individual States have made partial surveys that were very good, but none of these are recent.

With frequent recurrence of industrial conflicts and periods of unrest in the various coal fields, considered in relation to the vital connection of this industry with our domestic and industrial life, no argument should be necessary to show the importance of authentic and impartial information as to the real labor situation in the coal fields—information secured over a wide enough area and upon sufficiently broad principles to satisfy the public and challenge the respect of both parties to all issues.

That is in effect the statement made by this bureau seeking this appropriation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I live in a country that is dotted with soft-coal mines, springing up everywhere. My own city, for instance, is in the heart of the soft-coal fields. The conditions amongst the soft-coal miners in my district are deplorable. Although we are the center of a coal field, the price of coal has risen continually from 8 cents a bushel to nearly 20 cents a bushel this winter. The other day near my house in the city of Galesburg a man brought in a load of coal, and there were at least six different people who tried to buy that load of coal from that man, and it was impossible for them to make a purchase. They did not have the high price demanded and they could not buy it on credit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why is it that, with coal surrounding them on all sides, the people of a community are required to pay 20 cents a bushel for it?

In an investigation which I had occasion to make in a lawsuit some time ago I found that the mines were delivering coal to their purchasers at \$1.05 a ton. That was in February, three years ago. I also found that the purchasing agents who

bought the output of that mine were selling it at Chicago for \$3.75 a ton during that winter.

Now, what is the explanation of that? The miner is not getting it, and the mine is not getting it, but the identical men who own the mines constitute the directors of the corporation that was selling the output of that mine, and they put the difference between \$1.05, which went to the mines, and \$3.75, which the purchaser paid, into their pockets.

Mr. COX. What was the freight haul from your place to Chicago?

Mr. RUCKER. It probably was the same that it was a year ago.

Mr. KING. Yes. It was the same as a year ago. The usual alleged reasons for the high price of coal in the United States are mere moonshine—the lack of cars furnished by the railroads. The railroads are always supplying cars. The trouble is that the selling agencies in the city of Chicago are controlling, in that part of the country at least, the output of coal which the poor people must have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Does the gentleman from Tennessee insist on his point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has said. I do not undertake to deny the importance of this investigation, but I think it is a matter that ought to come up before the House in a regular legislative way. I think it is a matter that ought to be considered by the committee that has jurisdiction of legislation, and that it is not proper to insert it upon an appropriation bill. Therefore, I must make the point of order, regardless of what my personal views might be.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers the amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 133, after line 23, insert the following item:

"Industrial surveys: To enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct descriptive industrial surveys for determining occupational opportunities and for the employment of suitable persons to conduct such surveys and for needed clerical assistants, whether within or outside the District of Columbia, such persons to be selected in accordance with the civil-service regulations, \$21,600."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this would have to do with the supply of labor, or perhaps it would be better to say with the opportunity for workingmen to secure work, and it would also have to do with the employers knowing the resources, where they could secure the sort of labor they desired. Therefore such a provision, such a law, providing for this work to be done, would render great assistance to the industrial world, both to the employer and the employee.

In many of the European countries they have systems similar to that to which this perhaps would lead, and which I studied some years ago, but not recently. I found that those systems have developed industry in some of these European countries, especially in Germany, where there was not such a thing as a tramp. The system took care of the unemployed and pointed out where they could secure employment. Therefore, the result of this would be something that would be of great benefit to the American people.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to say again, with reference to this particular amendment, that without questioning the importance of this investigation the committee did not undertake to go into that matter, believing as they did that matters of such importance ought to come before the House in the regular legislative way. They believed, in other words, that this matter ought to come before the House by way of a bill or resolution reported by the regular committee of the House which has jurisdiction of this particular kind of legislation, and that it was improper to insert legislation of this kind in an appropriation bill—legislation which had not been previously considered by the committee and by the House. For that reason I am constrained to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have one or two other amendments here, and I see that it is no use to take up the time of the House to offer them. Therefore I will ask unanimous consent to print them in the Record at this place.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to print certain amendments in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following are the proposed amendments referred to:

On page 133, after line 23, insert the following item: "Collation of industrial accident statistics: To enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collate State statistics of industrial accidents and to make special studies to determine accident rates by industries and causes, \$11,400."

On page 133, after line 23, insert the following: "Government shops: To enable the Bureau of Labor Statistics to conduct investigations of wages and hours of labor to determine prevailing rates for the purpose of adjusting wages in Government shops, \$2,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Children's Bureau: Chief, \$5,000; assistant chief, \$2,400; experts—1 on sanitation \$2,800, industrial \$2,000, social service \$2,000, librarian \$2,000, statistical \$2,000; special agents—1 \$1,800, 4 at \$1,600 each, 10 at \$1,400 each, 12 at \$1,200 each; private secretary to chief of bureau, \$1,500; clerks—2 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 5 of class 2, 18 of class 1, 10 at \$1,000 each; copyist; messenger; in all, \$106,640.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: At page 134, lines 15 to 22, strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Children's Bureau: Chief, \$5,000; assistant chief, \$5,000; experts—1 on sanitation \$2,800, industrial \$2,000, social service \$2,000, librarian \$2,000, statistical \$2,000, research \$2,000; special agents—1 at \$1,800, 4 at \$1,600 each, 15 at \$1,400 each, 20 at \$1,200 each; private secretary to the chief of bureau, \$1,500; clerks—administrative \$2,000, 5 of class 4, 8 of class 3, 11 of class 2, 25 of class 1, 27 at \$1,000 each; 5 copyists; messenger; assistant messenger; in all, \$178,760."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Iowa wishes to discuss it, I will be glad to reserve it. I did not know he wanted to speak on it.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the Children's Bureau was established by act of Congress approved April 9, 1912. For the first three years of the life of this bureau we appropriated annually \$25,640. That provided for a force of 15 persons. For the last three years we have appropriated \$106,640, which provided for a force of 76 persons. I do not believe there is any bureau in any of the departments of the Government that is really doing a greater work for all the people than the Children's Bureau is doing.

The mortality of children is considered in all civilized countries as the best index of the morals and social welfare of a country. This is so well stated by Sir Arthur Newsholme, the great English statistician, that I quote his words:

Infant mortality is the most sensitive index we possess of social welfare. If babies were well born and well cared for, their mortality would be negligible. The infant death rate measures the intelligence, health, and right living of fathers and mothers, the standards of morals and sanitation of communities and governments, the efficiency of physicians, nurses, health officers, and educators.

It is not altogether to our credit that we are lagging far behind much smaller countries than ours in the matter of the protection of the lives of our children. This is an educational question. Information upon it varies in different localities. In some communities, among children of a certain class, as many as 27 per cent of these little babies die before they attain the age of one year; and the investigation that the department has made already leads us to discover certain fundamentals which, if carried to the homes of these people, will save a great many of the children. Think of it! It is estimated that last year more than 300,000 little babies under 12 months old died in the United States. In 1910 in the city of New York out of every 5 deaths 1 was an infant under 12 months of age. More deaths of infants under 12 months are occurring every day than from tuberculosis in all forms and of persons of all ages. Where the fathers and mothers of these children have been told how to take care of them, how and on what to feed them, and how to house them the death rate has materially decreased.

Little New Zealand is far ahead of us. She commenced the investigation before we did, and when she commenced the investigation the death rate of children under 12 months was over 9 per cent. Since that investigation they have reduced the death rate of infants of all ages in New Zealand to 5 per cent, and they have reduced the death rate of infants under 12 months to 3½ per cent, while in the United States the death rate of infants is more than 13 per cent. Here we have a paltry sum as compared with what is necessary to carry on this investigation.

The amendment I have offered is subject to a point of order. It is the estimate of that splendid woman who is at the head of this bureau. She is doing a great work and should have all she asks for. It is her estimate of what it will cost to carry on this great work, and I feel that the chairman of the committee ought not to make a point of order, but ought to let us take up

this question and discuss it like men—for we are not boys—and decide what force is necessary to carry on this work in an intelligent and forceful way, and then make the appropriation accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on that.

Mr. GOOD. I am going to offer another amendment on the same subject.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then I will ask recognition when that amendment is offered.

Mr. GOOD. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: At the end of line 22, page 134, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"To investigate and report upon matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, and especially to investigate the question of infant mortality, \$72,120."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will listen to the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries a lump-sum appropriation for identically this kind of work; but I want to submit to the gentleman from Iowa that even if this amendment be adopted, it does not in any sense increase the force here in the city of Washington, because under the law those employed under this lump sum could not be used here in the city of Washington, but must be used entirely for field work; and if the gentleman, by introducing this amendment, seeks to increase the clerical force here in the District of Columbia certainly this amendment will not do it.

Mr. GOOD. I am not seeking to increase the clerical force here in Washington. That can not be done in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think that the amendment is in order, in view of the succeeding paragraph, which undertakes to make an appropriation for the field work of this bureau. There is an item already carried in the bill for that.

The CHAIRMAN. On what page and line is that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. On page 134, beginning at line 23.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi). The Chair thinks it is not the province of the Chair to pass upon the effect of the appropriation. The law of 1912 was passed on by Chairman GARNER in 1914, and the Chair thinks the point of order is not well taken, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say something in behalf of this amendment. Representing as I do a part of the great congested district of the city of New York, and because of the experience I have had with this great work, and because of the results that have been obtained in the second congressional district of the State of New York, which I have the honor to represent, I feel that this additional appropriation would be an entirely proper thing to grant. I have taken occasion to call upon this department for assistance. They have responded willingly as far as their appropriations would permit; but we have many demands for a great deal more than can be done under the current appropriation. So therefore I want to ask those who have the welfare of the congested district in the great city of New York at heart to give us an opportunity to carry on this work that has done so much good.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, speaking in behalf of the rural districts, I want to say that having a personal knowledge of the work that this department has been doing, I believe there is no work of the United States Government departments that deserves more credit than that of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor and that of Miss Julia C. Lathrop, Chief of this Children's Bureau. The work she has done in my district deserves the commendation of the people, and I would be false to my trust if I did not raise my voice in behalf of this appropriation so as to be able to continue and further extend her good work, because I know that 95 per cent, if not 100 per cent, of the people in my district are in favor of extending this bureau and of giving Miss Lathrop more power and more money for this great work, and I am therefore in favor of larger appropriations, so that she may continue the splendid work she has done and the work that is contemplated, and particularly that which is set forth in her last report, her fourth annual report to the Congress. It shows what can be done and what ought to be done, and I trust that this amendment will be adopted unanimously. The fourth annual report of this bureau contains many good reasons for the enlarged appropriation for the work contemplated by it.

That children's welfare from babyhood to adolescence is bound up with industrial conditions is emphasized by this recent work of the Federal Children's Bureau, of which the chief, Miss Lathrop, tells in this report.

A study of infant mortality in Manchester, N. H., completed this year, adds new evidence that when the fathers' earnings are low or the mothers work out of the home the infant mortality rate is exceptionally high. In Manchester it varies from 1 death among every 4 babies where fathers earn less than \$450 to 1 death among every 16 babies where fathers earn \$1,050 or more.

Miss Lathrop's report refers to the effect of living conditions upon mothers, and points out that the sickness or death of the mother lessens the baby's chances for life and health. The bureau has prepared a statistical study of maternal mortality, and finds that 15,000 mothers die year by year in this country from largely preventable causes incident to maternity and that the death rate from maternal causes has not decreased since 1900. Miss Lathrop says in commenting upon this fact:

The means of prevention are the instruction of the mother, skilled supervision before the birth of her child, and suitable care during confinement. But she must have also nourishing food and sufficient rest and freedom from anxiety—in other words, decent living conditions.

Then the bureau has been concerned with the protection of the child itself from premature employment. It has published all the child-labor laws in the United States and has completed a report on the administration of the employment certificate system in New York State. In commenting upon the new Federal child-labor law as marking a distinct advance in the attitude of this Nation toward that one-third of its population which is under 16 years of age, Miss Lathrop says:

Merely keeping the breath of life in children is valueless to the Nation unless they are brought on to adult life trained masters of their full powers of body and mind. The law is a national measure, and all attainable information for a better understanding of the ways in which the children it sets free from labor may be started in life should be furnished by a national study.

It is a matter of speculation as to what proportion of children at work are dependent upon their own earnings or support families in whole or in part. Also, the number of dependent children now supported by public and private funds is unknown. In fact—

Miss Lathrop says—

our ignorance of the whole field of dependency is great.

The report gives figures about Philadelphia indicating that the majority of dependent children are members of families, and the question of protecting them is a question of family structure and support. Preliminary work toward a study of dependency has been done by the bureau, and Miss Lathrop expresses the hope that Congress may direct the Children's Bureau to make a special inquiry into the condition of the children to be affected by the Federal law.

Why are there so many deaths among country babies and country mothers? And what should the Federal Government do about it? Miss Lathrop in this report describes its new rural studies of child and maternal welfare which combine a scientific inquiry with work of immediately practical value to the children of the neighborhoods visited, and suggests a constructive plan for the future.

The report gives many reasons for extending this rural work. First, the Census Bureau's figures show average infant mortality rates in the rural districts higher than the mortality rates found by the Children's Bureau in the more prosperous sections of the cities which it has studied.

Again, the census figures show a markedly high death rate among country women of child-bearing age for which a large number of preventable deaths from maternal causes appears to be responsible. It is estimated that more than 15,000 women die year by year in the United States from conditions incident to maternity, while the extent of unnecessary ill health is at present unknown. "The sickness or death of a mother inevitably lessens the chances of her baby for life and health, and it is plain that the question of maternal care in rural districts is of genuine public interest."

An argument for better care of rural childhood is based on the high percentage of physical defects among children in rural schools given in reports of State boards of health. Miss Lathrop concludes:

These comparisons are a strong indication that there is room for great permanent improvement in maternal and child welfare in rural districts. The day when all children shall be well born and well cared for is far ahead, but surely that day should dawn first for the country.

In connection with the bureau's rural studies a child-hygiene expert holds a children's health conference, to which parents bring their children for examination and advice about daily care (but not for medical diagnosis or treatment). Parents have shown great eagerness for this kind of help in the counties already visited, bringing their children often long distances, over bad roads, and even sacrificing farm work for the journey.

State and other local officials are urging the bureau to cooperate with them in similar studies and demonstrations in many States, and a number of rural units to extend this work are among the items for which the bureau asks a larger staff and appropriation. Miss Lathrop believes that such Federal studies, making plain the necessity and suggesting a method are bound to lead toward adequate local provision for maternal and child welfare.

May I have unanimous consent to extend my remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request will be granted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the Children's Bureau was created a little over four years ago—five years ago next spring, I believe. It has more than justified the fondest anticipations of its friends. There was a prolonged consideration of the subject before the bureau was created. It was finally created. The office of chief of the bureau was filled by the appointment of Miss Julia C. Lathrop, who was appointed by President Taft and continued in office by President Wilson. No one has suggested that there ever was in any way whatever any partisan consideration in the action of the bureau.

We are going to appropriate at this session of Congress possibly close to \$2,000,000,000, a large share of which will be for the purpose of possible engagement in the destruction of human beings through defensive war. It seems to me that we may well add a little to the appropriation to save the babies of the country. This bureau is engaged very largely in giving needed information to present and future mothers of the country in order that they may properly care for the babies that are born into the world. We are adding by this amendment less than \$100,000. One hundred thousand dollars can well be saved. We can afford to make this appropriation, we can afford to give these mothers of the country this little assistance. I hope that this committee and this House will not feel that it is extravagant, but only doing a small mite of justice in promoting the welfare of the children and babies of the country. God bless them. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat surprised, as I think many must have been, who have known the facts, that the only increase that we have ever been able to obtain for this bureau of the Government has been obtained as we are endeavoring to do now, on the floor of the House. I understand the position of the gentlemen of the committee who in general are endeavoring to keep down the appropriations of the Government. I have nothing but words of praise for them, especially this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. In this bill I think they have kept as closely as possible to the necessary expenditures of the Government. In a general way their record is good.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman may be aware that the original law creating this bureau limited the amount of the appropriation. The original act defines what shall be the operating expenses of the bureau. That is the reason that changes were made on the floor of the House.

Mr. TOWNER. That would hardly apply to an amendment of this character. As already stated, the United States of America, which ought to be foremost in this kind of work, is lagging behind almost every civilized nation of the world in regard to it. Other nations are devoting large expenditures for the purposes in furtherance of which this bureau was created. Certainly nothing could more appeal to the broad humanitarian spirit of the age than work of this character. And it is so particularly advantageous, it is so immediately beneficial, it brings results that every one can see so easily are in the highest degree desirable that it certainly ought to appeal to even those who are the most economically inclined. All over the United States we find conditions existing where a mere increase of knowledge would bring immensely better conditions. It is in many cases absolutely true that infant mortality is dependent on knowledge and care. We now have a percentage of 13 of infant mortality, and it is estimated that it may be reduced to 3 or 4 per cent by the wide dissemination of such knowledge as this department is sending out everywhere to the people of the United States.

Take the question of the care of the infants during the first 12 months of their lives. It is shown that by the dissemination of knowledge made available by this department a betterment of conditions has resulted which causes a saving of lives that is nothing less than marvelous. In many cases infant mortality has been reduced more than one-half merely by knowledge disseminated by this bureau. Not only are they doing that class of work, but they are doing an important work in furnishing the mothers with knowledge in regard to prenatal conditions that

have so much to do with the health of the infant after it comes into the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. They have sent out a bulletin to the mothers on this very important subject, and it is wonderful how large the demand is for this bulletin in the country districts where aid is not easily procured and in the mining and mountain districts where they can not easily have the services of a physician. The bulletins printed in regard to this have gone into the homes of those who are soon to become mothers, and they have blessed the Government for sending to them information in that most trying period of a mother's life. This increase is merely to extend and make more general the application of this knowledge to the people everywhere that it may be needed and desired. I think no one who has had anything to do with the management of this most admirable bureau of the department but has been led to express in highest terms his admiration for the way in which it has been managed. Miss Julia C. Lathrop, in my judgment, is the woman best fitted for this work in all the world to-day. Her fame is not bound by this Nation by any means, because the result of her work and the suggestions of this department have gone into every civilized nation in the world because of the remarkable ability and practical value displayed under the present management. All of the assistants, those immediately engaged with Miss Lathrop, seem inspired with a like spirit and work with the highest philanthropic aims. There is no work that appeals more nearly to that which is highest and best for the cause of humanity than the work of this bureau. In my judgment, to refuse the needed increases from year to year that are demanded by this department would be a reflection upon the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that on either side of this House there can be this feeling. I know that men sometimes object to this class of legislation because they say it is an undue extension of governmental powers, but in this and similar instances there is no possible way in which this work can be done except by the General Government, and we all know that there is continually coming from the people more of a demand for service in the social betterment of the citizens of the land. We all know that this is the class of legislation that most directly appeals to the hearts and consciences of the American people, and so I sincerely hope that there will be no opposition on the part of the committee to this amendment and that the membership of the House will understand that if there can be any possible increase justified in any appropriation or in any bureau of this Government it is most certainly justified in this instance. [Applause.]

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I have always been or tried to be an advocate of consistent economy. I have assisted as far as my best judgment has always dictated in keeping the expenditures of the Government as low as possible, that they might be in harmony with the legitimate needs of public welfare. Fifteen years of my life have been partly devoted to the duties incident to the care and keeping of the delinquents and unfortunates in my State, and during those years I have learned to my everlasting satisfaction that about 75 per cent and sometimes more of the unfortunates that go into our State institutions and become public charges are there not of their own volition but because of some defect due to environment or heredity. They are there because some ancestor or evil environment had imbued them with criminality or mental misfortune. I believe that the Children's Bureau is the longest step in the direction of creating better health and therefore more happiness for the people of the United States than any other legislative enactment on which I have ever voted, and I want to see it strengthened. I want to see it strengthened for several reasons, and especially for the reason that it furnishes so much comfort and hope for the motherhood of the country. I do not know how it may be in other districts, but in my district I know that the young mothers of the district are associating themselves into mothers' clubs for the betterment of child life, and they are not asking me for information, but going direct to the Children's Bureau. They are doing this not because of lack of information on the upbringing of their own little ones, but because they are ambitious to contribute to less fortunate mothers the knowledge that the Children's Bureau of this country may give, and I hope the increase that is asked for in this appropriation may be granted. Inasmuch as we are so ready to furnish means of keeping and drilling men to take human life, I want to see something done in the direction of protecting and preserving it, and I believe that the enacting of legislation of this sort is

going to do more to make better conditions for future humanity and the trips of the little white hearses less frequent than anything we can do, and to that end I am heartily in favor of this amendment. [Applause.] As for me, I want to go slow in spending public money in doubtful experiments of any kind, but when it comes to conserving the future health and happiness of the people I would rather spend thousands too much than to lack one dollar of meeting a requirement of human welfare. [Applause.]

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations in dealing with this matter has been liberal with this bureau. In 1915 \$25,000 were appropriated and then \$81,000 additional. From 1913 down to 1917 in this city this office has increased over \$75,000. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa does not increase the force in Washington, but increases or attempts to increase a field force which is not organized, nor does the law provide for a field force. This bureau when it was created was intended for the purpose of furnishing information to the country. It can not take charge of the children. It can only furnish the information. Now, if this \$78,000 additional which the gentleman from Iowa is asking for goes in the bill in this form, then the \$78,000 can not be used, because it can not be used here in the District, and it can not be used in the field force, for the reason that the work done by the Children's Bureau is nothing more nor less than the sending out of documents and pamphlets. Some investigation is made, it is true, but the chief work of the bureau is to send out information in reference to child life.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I merely want to ask the gentleman if he contends that the work of the Children's Bureau should be confined to the city of Washington and that under the law—

Mr. SISSON. I am not contending that it should.

Mr. KEATING. And that under the law the bureau is not authorized to conduct any investigation outside of the city of Washington.

Mr. SISSON. No; I said except to conduct investigation.

Mr. KEATING. Would not that be the work of the field force?

Mr. SISSON. There is a separate fund for that, and it has nothing to do with this particular item here. There is another item in the bill providing for investigation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. If I have the time, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Is it not a fact that the force now provided in the Children's Bureau was first provided in a bill where the House inserted an item just exactly like this over the protest of my genial friend from Mississippi?

Mr. SISSON. I do not think that at that time I was on this subcommittee. I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. That is the way it got in, is it not?

Mr. SISSON. That is not a reason why it should be done in that way now.

Mr. MANN. That may not be a reason, but that shows how to do it.

Mr. SISSON. The question is this: Whether or not in this department in Washington this money is needed? In the first place, there is not a State in the Union that does not maintain a department of health. Great sums of money are expended by the State looking after the health of its communities. In addition to that, every county in the United States, so far as I know, maintains a county health department. In addition to that, the Federal Government spends on the Bureau of Health, that of which Dr. Blue is the head, over \$20,000,000; and in a great deal of the work done by the Children's Bureau, if you will investigate the pamphlets which were prepared in the medical department of the Government under Dr. Blue's supervision, you will find many of those reports sent out in the past have been nothing but duplications of those documents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. I realize fully the sentiment to which men appeal, and if you should appeal to the business mind and business judgment of the Congress, and not to their sentiment, you would find infinitely less disposition to duplicate work we are now duplicating. If the Children's Bureau is to look after the health of the children, it ought to be in the Department of Health, where they can get the benefit of all of the information

in that department. But they are now doing a similar work in that department, gentlemen of the committee, and spending a great deal of money in investigating children's diseases, in caring for children, and have been for a number of years sending out that information; so when you increase this appropriation to \$78,000 you are doing nothing more or less than duplicating the work done by the Bureau of Health. But when you make an appeal to people in the interest of children, if the demand were for \$10,000,000, you would get it just as easily if you consult your sentiments. I do not want gentlemen to consult the mere question of sentimentality. The information that is sent out reaches an infinitesimally small part of the motherhood of the country. Doctors all over the country that I know are giving that information which medical science can bring to bear upon all of these questions, and they have made marvelous strides and marvelous progress. I do not know just how far the Federal Government is going. I do not know whether they will go to the extent of sending men to the bedside of the sick. I do not know whether they are going to provide physicians and nurses by the Government, but there must be some limit somewhere to the growth of this bureau; and with the growth of this bureau from \$25,000 to over \$100,000, and then when you add the increase for the field force and other increases, no department in the Government has increased so rapidly, and that rapid increase has been due to the very kind of speeches which have been made here to-day. They do not tell you practically what is being done. They simply say in general terms they are doing so much for the children.

Go back to your districts, go back to your homes, and ask for the specific cases and for the specific mothers who have gotten this information, and you will find to your amazement they are extremely few. But when you make an appeal to expend money out of the Federal Treasury for purposes of this kind it is only necessary to make an appeal; nothing further is said or thought of what goes with the fund. I am just as much interested in their health in the future and in the welfare of children as anybody. I have children of my own. I believe that nothing can be done for the children that would be cheaply done, but the States of the Union maintain public schools, maintain physicians to supervise those schools. They have investigations conducted by the county and by the State in reference to the health in the institutions and the physicians themselves in the States hand out all the information with reference to child life, doing duty in the public schools, and the department under Dr. Blue has physicians there who make a specialty of studying children's diseases and sending out these documents which doctors throughout the country are asking for, and this is a mere duplication of some of the statistical information and a duplication of work or a cut almost made literally in many cases from documents prepared by the Department of Health here. Therefore I can see no earthly use in increasing this appropriation \$78,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to cut anybody off, but I would like to have some agreement for time for debate upon this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Count me in for five minutes.

Mr. BENNET. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I wish five minutes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there ought to be some agreement as to how this time is to be divided.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think over five gentlemen desire to talk.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the gentleman from Iowa there has only been one speech made by a member of the committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there has been over 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. There has only been used about 10 minutes in favor of it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MANN. I did not take over five minutes, and none of the rest of the gentlemen did.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There were three or four speeches made in favor of it. I will say 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by myself and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate close on this amendment in 30 minutes, 15 minutes of which is to be under the control of the gentleman from Iowa and 15 minutes under the control of the gentleman from Tennessee. Is there objection? [After a

pause.] The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the State which I have the honor to represent in part is in the category of States mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], which already do a great deal for the children. We do have school nurses and we do have investigations in relation to children. But, I say very frankly, there is not a constituency of the 43 Members from the State of New York but that would support the Member representing that constituency in a vote in favor of this amendment concerned with this comparatively small amount of \$72,000.

In the State of New York we believe in the conservation of children. It is quite true we believe in preparedness, and we vote large sums to the Army and Navy gladly, but we are even more willing, and I know I speak for the entire 43 Members, to act for these humanitarian ideas which tend to the betterment of the race. I hope that this proposition will carry largely.

I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, how much time does the gentleman from New York yield back?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CASEY). The gentleman from New York has used one minute.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. When Congress passed the bill creating the Children's Bureau it did not intend that the bureau should be placed in a strait-jacket. I am certain it was the thought of Congress that the work of the bureau should be developed in a natural fashion.

The bureau has been in existence four years. For the first two years Miss Lathrop was satisfied with the appropriation which took care of the office force in the District of Columbia.

Then on the floor of this House she was given a lump-sum appropriation for the purpose of extending the work throughout the country. Now she has come to Congress with a request for an extension of this work, and naturally that extension will require more money.

If her requests are granted, we will expend on this bureau something over \$300,000. That is a very good beginning, but personally I hope to live to see the day when this bureau will be spending millions of dollars and spending those millions for the care of the children of the United States.

It is not a question of how much money you spend in this cause. The sole question we should ask is, Is the money being properly expended? In other words, are we getting a dollar of value for every dollar we expend? And I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that every man familiar with the work of the Children's Bureau is prepared to vouch for the truth of the statement that we are getting a dollar's worth of value for every dollar we expend. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the child is the most important thing in the world, for upon the children of to-day depends the civilization of to-morrow.

Within a short time we will be called upon to consider the military and naval appropriation bills. We will vote more than \$800,000,000 to purchase or construct the machinery with which human lives may be destroyed. Before we enter on that gruesome work let us pause for a few minutes to appropriate the trifling sum suggested for the upkeep of an institution designed to conserve human life.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, those of us who oppose the increased allowance can not be put into the attitude of opposing the work of this bureau. If the Members of this House were acquainted with the activities under the direction of the present chief they might not be so sympathetically inclined to this amendment. It was called to our attention in the hearings that work is being done in certain fields that are not national but purely local. In Baltimore they are engaged on the question of infant mortality, a purely municipal matter. In Delaware we find them infringing on the work of the Bureau of Public Health in investigating the condition of the feeble-minded, a function of the Board of Public Health of that State and pertaining solely to it, and to which investigation the State is not contributing one cent. To Baltimore, for instance, the chief of this bureau, an estimable woman, sends its representatives, at \$1,400 a year, and pays them at the rate of \$4 per diem extra for every day in the year, when their home is virtually in Baltimore.

This proposition is one that purely provides for an increase of salaries. The head of the bureau comes before Congress to-day and asks for an increase of appropriation of \$164,000, doubling almost the appropriation that is now provided. Here are the estimates, and they show that she wants to increase the salaries of these officials. She has one assistant for which she wants to provide an increase of \$2,600, and there is another she wants to employ at \$3,500. During the last fiscal year she had a force of 77, 65 temporary assistants, employed at a total expenditure of \$13,000. She only intends to employ permanently 66, with an expenditure of \$46,900.

The question before the House is whether you are going to run wild with sentiment. She has the idea of having a traveling railroad car going around the country like the Fish Commission has, displaying the work of this bureau. Perhaps that is very commendable, but there would be no harm in moving slowly. We believe there are certain activities, and it is supported by the testimony, as to the work in Baltimore and Delaware, where the money appropriated for those activities can be utilized in these other lines for which she is asking appropriation. When you find a bureau running wild with expenditure, is it the province of the committee which is charged with a detailed investigation of this matter to also run wild? We are all interested in children's welfare, but your committee believed there were ample funds under the existing appropriation that could carry on this work in a reasonable, rational way, rather than being stampeded by the activity of a very commendable woman at the head of a bureau of this Government. We have treated this bureau in no wise differently than any other bureau of the Government. Just because it is presided over by a woman is no reason why we should adopt a different policy. We have amply provided funds in our appropriation to carry on the legitimate work of the bureau, but we did not believe it was wise to have her provided with funds to duplicate work that naturally belongs to the Public Health Service and the Bureau of Education.

This amendment is to be followed by another carrying \$52,000. I would call upon those on this side to consider the economy phase of the proposals. If we are going to be launched into these activities all at once, multiplying the appropriations of every bureau 100 per cent a year, where are we going to land? The appropriation carried in the bill provides ample funds for the bureau to continue its proper functions, but does not provide funds for launching into fields of endeavor properly within the province of other bureaus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not often find myself advocating an increased appropriation over that recommended by the committee.

Mr. BENNET. Amen! [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. But whenever I find children at stake I will not hesitate, and I will not let a few paltry dollars stand between them and my vote. I will not hesitate to support an increased appropriation when I know that that appropriation will bring life, health, happiness, prosperity, and comfort to some lonely home in this land. [Applause.]

For many years there has been an agitation going on in this country for the conservation of our national resources. The Agricultural appropriation bill carries millions of dollars for the protection of our national forests. For many years there has been an agitation going on for the conservation of other national resources, to wit, our great waterways, oil, gas, and so forth, all of which I have been for, and all of which I am for to-day. Yet the great resources of our Nation to-day lie not in our national forests, lie not in our rivers, gas and oil wells, but our great national resources are in our homes, in our children, in our families. If this little appropriation could save the life of one child—it is only \$78,000—and the membership of this House should be convinced that that appropriation would save the life of one child, we would raise that amount out of our own pockets in 30 seconds. We would not pause a moment. I repeat that if we were convinced that by raising a private subscription here of \$78,000 we could save the life of one little child, we would pay it out of our pockets.

Now, my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], for whom I have the profoundest respect, says they are going to run cars over this country as an object lesson. He says that is in contemplation. Suppose they are. That is the very thing that the railroads are doing to-day. That is the very thing that the great agricultural colleges are doing—running cars all over the United States, in connection with the railroads, stopping at the various railroad stations and teaching the farmers how to pack their

eggs, how to put up their butter in shape, how to ship apples and other kinds of produce to market.

I was here when the Bureau of Mines was established. If my recollection is correct, that bureau started out with an appropriation of \$50,000 a year. That bureau is now expending a little more than a million dollars a year, and I take it for granted that that appropriation has had a tendency to reduce the death rate in the mining industry of the country. The Bureau of Mines is constantly and continuously engaged in running cars and presenting object lessons in the various mining districts of this country showing and teaching the miners how they can best take care of and preserve their lives.

If Miss Lathrop, the head of the Children's Bureau, by the operation of a car—if she can preserve the life of one child—let her have the money necessary to do it. This Congress will appropriate between \$600,000,000 and \$800,000,000 for the Army and Navy of the Union, in my opinion, which will be used to fight the graveyards of Europe. The official statements as to the revenues for the fiscal year 1918 and the estimated expenditures for the same year mean that 94 per cent of all the revenues that we are going to collect in 1918 are going to be used to prepare for wars or to pay for past wars in the way of pensions. If Congress can have the nerve to do that, to appropriate between \$600,000,000 and \$800,000,000 to build up a powerful Army and to establish a great Navy in this country, in my opinion the money will be well spent if we spend \$78,000 to take care of the little children of the country. They are our natural resources. The militarists tell us that the first line of defense of a country is in the Navy and that the second line is in its coast-line fortifications and that its third line of defense is in the Army. I deny that. The first line of defense of this or any other country is the children of the country [applause], and if by any appropriation or any amount of money there can be built up in this country a strong, active fighting race of men and women who are able to take care of themselves, that money, in my judgment, will be well and economically expended. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the sum total of all conservation is the conservation of the human race. The same God that in benign love held a little child up and said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," said to the fathers of the universe that he who provided not for his own household was worse than an infidel.

The principal element, the sublime element, of every household is the little buds on the stem of life that cluster around the threshold of the family altar, and an appropriation that seeks to protect and guard, guide and defend the woman in gestation, to bring forth a child and protect it in its tender, helpless age while it is here and develop it into ripened and matured manhood is the grandest of all conservation.

I am for increasing this appropriation and keeping it sufficient to protect, guard, and guide the hapless, hopeless little ones that come into our complex civilization, often amid tenements of squalor, unprovided for, unprotected, and unhelped. I am for the appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised that we should hesitate to increase the appropriation for the Children's Bureau by \$72,000. Last year we increased the appropriation for foot-and-mouth disease by \$2,500,000. We appropriated over \$360,000 for hog cholera. We appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars for the eradication of the southern cattle tick, of the cotton-boll weevil, and other things of that kind. But when it comes to making an appropriation at all commensurate with the great work of the Children's Bureau we hesitate and quibble.

Gentlemen say there is a duplication of work. I deny that there is in the least any duplication of work performed by the Children's Bureau and the Public Health Service. It is to the credit of these two services of the Government that there is complete agreement and complete coordination with regard to their work.

During the last year there was conducted under the Children's Bureau what was known as Baby Week. It was an educational campaign. It cost some money, it is true. It was carried on in 2,082 communities throughout the United States; but this Gov-

ernment did not pay all of the expenses of that campaign out of the Treasury. Out in Los Angeles, Cal., the county commissioners appropriated out of the treasury of that county \$1,000, and private individuals appropriated or gave \$500 more for the campaign. In 2,082 communities they carried the gospel to mothers of little infants, telling them how to care for them, how to protect and prolong their lives. Think of it! This great Nation, the richest nation in the world, follows New Zealand, instead of leading all the countries in the world in the preservation of the lives and health of its infants. In New Zealand they have reduced the death rate of infants under 12 months of age to 3.8 per cent, while in the United States more than 125 infants out of every 1,000 die before they attain the age of 12 months.

But gentlemen says that this money is wrongfully expended, that we are expending this money in Baltimore and not in Washington. Yes; we are in Baltimore, just as we went into other cities and towns throughout the United States. We went to Manchester, N. H., where some very valuable information was obtained. How can we obtain these facts? How can the Children's Bureau ascertain any fact that is worth knowing without going to representative communities throughout the United States and conducting an investigation? That is just what this money is wanted for. It was never intended that the lives and health of the infants of the city of Washington only should be investigated. It was intended that a general survey should be made covering the whole United States, and that we should make ample appropriations to make that survey and ascertain why it is that in a certain locality as many as 270 little babies out of every 1,000 die every year. That is the work that Miss Lathrop has been doing, and that is the purpose of this amendment. In order to be fair with the House I will say that when this amendment is adopted, as I am confident it will be—because I have enough faith in the intelligence of this House to believe that they will not halt when it comes to the exercise of their duty in providing for this great work—I shall then offer another amendment to take care of the contingent expense of carrying on this additional work. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly well aware how impossible it is to stem the tide of appeals to sentiment; but I do think that before the House votes upon this proposition we ought to stop and look it squarely in the face, with some degree of reason for such action as we may take.

There has been no argument made here upon this amendment, nothing except a pure appeal to sentiment. Now, let us see what are the facts with reference to this particular bureau. I yield to no man upon this floor in my loyalty to this bureau and the great work that it is accomplishing. I am entirely in accord with the bureau and I appreciate what it is doing. But, gentlemen, we should look at this matter coolly and calmly. The law was passed about four years ago. When that law was passed the number of employees and clerks who should be employed was written into the statute, and if I am not mistaken the argument was made upon the floor of the House at the time that the appropriation would never be increased; and in order to prevent that appropriation being increased the law provided something that no other law creating any bureau ever provided. It was written into the statute the number of employees who should be employed in that bureau, so that in the future a point of order would lie against the attempt of any Member to increase that force. That was only four years ago. Two years ago, as has been stated, an amendment was offered appropriating a lump sum in addition to the appropriation for the clerical force, and the House adopted that amendment. The result has been that within two years after the creation of that bureau, notwithstanding the fact that the friends of the measure stated at the time that it never would cost more than \$25,640, we find the appropriation increased to \$164,640, or an increase of over 640 per cent in two years, and that is what the bill carries to-day. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has offered an amendment here seeking to provide an increase of over \$72,000, and he tells you with the utmost frankness and candor that when you adopt this amendment he proposes to come forward with another amendment of a similar amount.

Mr. GOOD. Not a similar amount, but a larger amount.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman state how much?

Mr. GOOD. Increasing the amount from \$58,000 to \$95,000—to strike out \$58,000 and insert \$95,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman according to his own statement—and we appreciate his candor—proposes to follow this amendment with another amendment increasing the appropriation still further by the sum of \$37,000, which would make an increase of over 1,000 per cent over and above what it was confidently stated here four years ago this bureau would cost the Government.

Now, I say I am in thorough sympathy with this bureau. I am in thorough sympathy with the work that is being done; but I want to ask you gentlemen, do you propose here, within four years after the creation of this bureau, to increase this appropriation to the extent of over 1,000 per cent? As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] have well said, this bureau—and I make the statement without fear of successful contradiction—is duplicating in some respects the work that is being done to-day by the Bureau of Public Health and the Bureau of Education. No one will deny the truth of that statement if he will take the pains to inquire into some of the things being done.

In making this statement I am not personally criticizing the splendid chief of this bureau, because she is enthusiastic in her work. She has it at heart. She is much interested in it; but, gentlemen, I say to you, we ought to pause and hesitate before we at this time, purely on account of an appeal to our sentiment and not to our reason, vote upon the people an increase of over 1,000 per cent over and above what it was said four years ago would be necessary to run this bureau.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman state what was the amount of the estimates this year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The amount of the estimates was over \$352,000.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What did the committee allow?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. One hundred and sixty-four thousand six hundred and forty dollars. Now, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] said a moment ago, the head of this bureau told the committee that it was her purpose if the appropriation was allowed to run a railway demonstration car all over the country, costing \$20,000 for equipment, and so forth. I do not know whether you gentlemen want that done or not, but I want to say that in the condition of our Treasury to-day, facing as we are a deficit, facing as we are a probable large bond issue, we ought to hesitate a long time before we undertake to increase appropriations to the amount that this amendment seeks to increase this appropriation. This is no time to unduly increase the burdens of our Government, however much a particular work may appeal to us for either personal or sentimental reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 141, noes 39.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, of officers, special agents, and other employees of the Children's Bureau; employment of experts and temporary assistants, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$8 a day, and of interpreters, to be paid at a rate not exceeding \$4 a day when actually employed; purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals, including the advance payment of subscriptions for the same, for newspaper clippings to enable the Children's Bureau to secure data regarding the progress of legislation affecting children and the activities of public and private organizations dealing with children, and for reprints from State, city, and private publications for distribution when said reprints can be procured more cheaply than they can be printed by the Government, \$58,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 16, page 135, strike out the figures "\$58,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa does not care to inform the House what is intended to be done with this increased appropriation, I will. At the present time the appropriation carries \$58,000. Of that amount, \$13,000 is expended for services. It is proposed to increase the salaries of the field officers, who now receive \$13,000, so that they will receive \$46,900. In addition to the estimate for \$31,000 for travel allowance, the head of the bureau wants to increase that to \$100,000. She wants the privilege granted to the assistants and employees of the bureau to go around the country at the expense of the Government to attend meetings of all kinds. Of course, we may single out this bureau presided over by this exemplary woman for special favor, but that rests with the committee. We have refused such allowances to bureaus presided over by men, including investigations pertaining to labor matters. It is purely a case where you are running wild with expenditure. It is the only bureau which allows to its employees assigned to a certain place for an indefinite period a per diem of \$4 for every day in the year, including Sundays and holidays. We have corrected that abuse in the Postal Service and in other services several years ago, but because this is the Children's Bureau appealing to the sympathy of all of us, of course, it should have carte blanche

and be allowed to pay extravagant salaries and a per diem allowance for every day in the year, including holidays and Sundays, no matter whether the employees are at home where they perform the work or not.

Mr. HELVERING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. You say the experts receive \$1,400 a year?

Mr. STAFFORD. The clerks in the field receive \$1,400, in addition to their per diem of \$4 per day for every day in the year.

Mr. HELVERING. If they are experts, that is not an exorbitant price, is it?

Mr. STAFFORD. The head of the bureau wishes to increase them to \$2,500, plus the per diem, which makes it far more than we are paying for any similar service of the Government.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, according to the statement submitted by the chief of the bureau it is proposed to expend for travel and subsistence and other field expenses, including office rent, telephones, and so forth, \$100,000; for reports and material for bureau publications and reprints, \$5,500; for books, newspapers, periodicals, and clippings, \$1,000; for exhibit material, including rental and equipment of demonstration car, \$20,000. The pending amendment, I presume, is intended to authorize the equipment of a car to be hauled over the country at the expense of the people, and to make it possible to rent offices and telephones all over the country. All very well, no doubt. But should we not at least pause a moment and think of the taxpayer, who seems to receive so little consideration when we come to vote upon some of the amendments proposed?

I noticed, Mr. Chairman, that upon the amendment voted on a few moments ago gentlemen on the Republican side voted almost solidly for the amendment, joining with a few Democrats on this side. I trust that hereafter we will not hear any criticism on the other side of the Chamber of the Democratic Party for running expenses of the Government up to an enormous extent. Certainly it does not lie in the mouths of the gentlemen on the other side, who are aiding in raising appropriations on this bill and whose votes have made it possible for these increases to be made, to criticize Democrats for increased appropriations and expenditures of the Government. I expect this amendment to be adopted, but I hope that gentlemen, at least on this side of the Chamber, will realize that we are facing a possible deficit in our Treasury next year, and that while the Republicans may continue, as they have consistently done in the past, to make it possible to pile up these appropriations, after all, we will be held responsible for them. I hope we will remember who will have to pay the bills. We have already given this bureau an increase of over \$72,000 by way of a lump sum, and why should we increase this particular lump sum of \$58,000 by \$37,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee) there were—ayes 103, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

National park commissioners: For commissioners in the Crater Lake, Glacier, Mount Rainier, and Yellowstone National Parks, at \$1,500 each, \$6,000. The provisions of section 21 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved May 28, 1896, shall not be construed as impairing the rights of said commissioners to receive the salaries provided herein.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. My recollection is that Congress last session passed a bill putting all of these parks under one commissioner. Did that finally become a law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman means the national park service bill?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That became a law.

Mr. COX. As I recollect it, that bill provided for one commissioner. This provision here is for three or four commissioners.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. These commissioners are all authorized by special act.

Mr. COX. If that bill to which I refer provides for one commissioner, what is the necessity for these?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The official to whom the gentleman from Indiana refers was to be the superintendent of all the parks. These are commissioners for the respective parks.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would state to the gentleman from Indiana that these commissioners correspond to the ordinary United States commissioners that are attached to the district courts throughout the States. They are men who examine first offenders and commit them for trial. These are

judicial officers. They are in the nature of a justice of the peace. When a man is apprehended in one of the national parks he is taken before the United States commissioner, and there must be a United States commissioner attached to each park.

Mr. COX. That explains it satisfactorily. What is the necessity for this language—

Shall not be construed as impairing the rights of said commissioners to receive the salaries provided herein.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That statute fixes the fees paid to United States commissioners. There are no fees, of course, in the parks, or if any they do not amount to anything, and as these commissioners get no fees therefore a salary is provided for them.

Mr. COX. They are on a separate salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. COX. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of necessary quarters in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, \$7,000; books, periodicals, stationery, supplies, traveling expenses, freight, telephone and telegraph, heat, light, a power service, drugs, chemicals, cleansers, furniture, and printing; pay of bailiffs and all other necessary employees not otherwise specifically provided for; and such other miscellaneous expenses as may be approved by the presiding judge, \$5,660; in all, \$12,660.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that in line 15, page 139, there is a typographical error. The article "a" should be "and," so as to make it read "heat, light, and power service," and I ask unanimous consent that the correction be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For custodian of the building occupied by the Court of Claims, \$500, to be paid on the order of the court, notwithstanding section 1765 of the Revised Statutes or section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for a moment. I reserved the point of order on an amendment he offered providing extra pay to the Chaplain until I could look into the matter. I desire now, after having conferred with the gentleman, to withdraw the point of order and to suggest that we take a vote upon the gentleman's amendment at this time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to that paragraph, page 12, line 15, for the purpose of offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, at the end of line 15, amend by inserting the following: "and \$600 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of order?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rose to make this suggestion. If this is necessary for the Chaplain, and I am in favor of it, ought it not to be made available at the present time instead of waiting until the fiscal year?

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I expect to introduce a resolution, which will go to the Committee on Accounts, taking care of the rest of the present year.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 140, to follow line 20, insert:

"No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any executive department of the Government in the city of Washington which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. I would just as soon discuss that now. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is a limitation on the appropriations carried in this bill. It is the same limitation that was offered to the legislative, executive, and

judicial appropriation bill last session, which was passed on by the then Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CRISP, after an extended debate. The ruling at that time was that it was a valid limitation, and I am satisfied the Chair will concur in that ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman if this amendment is in the exact wording of that amendment at the last session?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; and I can refer the Chair to the book and page. It was passed on at the last session on March 4, 1916, at page 4713 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am willing to submit the matter to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the present attitude of the House encourages me to believe that it will vote for any measure for economy in the Federal expenditures. I am quite certain that the sentiment which prevails here in the consideration of this bill is such that all I have to do is to say this decreases the Federal expenditures in order to get practically your unanimous vote. Most of you know there are some 470,000 Federal employees in the classified civil service. Of that number about 35,000 are in the city of Washington. Of the latter number about 7,000 work in the departments where the eight-hour day prevails. About 28,000 work in departments where the seven-hour day prevails. All of those who are outside of the District of Columbia, numbering nearly 440,000 employees, are required to work eight hours or longer. So that we have, apparently upon its face, an unjust discrimination or special privilege affecting about 7 per cent of the classified employees of the country, all of them being embraced in a few of the great executive departments here that are very close in touch with the business and financial interests of the District of Columbia. The failure of Congress to require an honest day's work on the part of the employees costs the Federal Government approximately \$5,000,000 a year. We talk about saving a few dollars in this department or that department when we are to-day expending \$5,000,000 of the people's money for a short day's service of our own employees who are closer to us and more immediately under our supervision than any other set of men. I am satisfied that the great bulk of these men, live and efficient employees, are as willing to work the full standard day of eight hours as they would be to work for a private employer the standard day of eight hours if Congress laid down that rule and made them do it. But there is a very powerful interest in the District of Columbia representing the merchants and landlords, who get all of the clerks' money eventually, who are opposed to any retrenchment and reform.

In other words, in plain English, gentlemen, you are asked whether you are going to vote a \$5,000,000 slice of "pork" to the merchants and landlords of the District of Columbia. Now, that is all there is to it. There is no particular hardship upon any competent and ambitious employee in compelling him to work the standard day. If the man in the shop can work an eight-hour day, as he does in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, in the Government Printing Office, and in the Government Ordnance Factory, the clerk in the department can work eight hours. I need not say the business inconvenience of the short day in the departments of Washington affects every business man who comes here to transact business with the Government. It is a constant source of annoyance, a constant source of delay, and a constant source of expense. I have long since ceased to defend that kind of business management in the departments of Washington. I tell my constituents plainly that it is an abuse and ought to be abolished. We are confronted, as the chairman of the committee has told you, with constantly increasing burdens of the Government. We need every dollar of the Federal revenue for the just, necessary, and unavoidable expenses of the Federal Government. There is no justification whatever for paying out \$5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for the advantage of a few landlords, merchants, and financial interests of the District of Columbia. You have to choose between the interests of the District of Columbia, viewed simply as the commercial and business interests, and the interests of the taxpayers of the country. You have no reason to fear any hardship to the men who are required to work eight hours, for you are now requiring men who work in your own districts in the Federal service to work eight hours and longer. You are now requiring the men in all mechanical pursuits in the District of Columbia to work eight hours and longer. You must regard this simply and solely as a Christmas present to the business interests of the District of Columbia. You will find there

is more pressure, more abuse heaped upon the heads of Congress, more whips cracked over the heads of Members of Congress by people in the District of Columbia who are not Members of Congress, who are not in the Federal service, than comes from your taxpayers or from the Federal employees themselves. You are confronting an influence and power which does not represent either the taxpayers nor the employees of the Government, but which represents the financial interests of the people here in the District of Columbia. Now, as a matter of fact, there is a sentiment here, and every man knows it—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND (continuing). To see that the Federal Government expends as much money as possible in the District of Columbia and get as little in return for it as possible. I am glad to say that does not come from the clerks themselves. It certainly does not come from your taxpayers and constituents. It does not come from the Members of Congress; but it comes from the powerful, well-knit, long-continued organizations in the District of Columbia. You must choose, then, between efficiency and economy in the Federal Service and the special private interests here in the District of Columbia. I want to emphasize again that we have got to provide at this session of Congress to meet the extraordinary expenses of the Government, even though we issue bonds to do it. Is there a gentleman here, when he comes to vote upon taxing his constituents by issuing bonds in the name of the Federal Government, who would be willing to have that coupled with a vote to perpetuate the special privilege of a short day's work for the employees of the Federal Government in the District here? Can you justify yourselves for handing out a slice of \$5,000,000 of pork for the financial interests of the District of Columbia? Put them on each side of the scales, your obligation of raising taxes to support this Government and your obligation to see that these taxes are expended for an honest day's work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BORLAND. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, yeas 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. That in expending appropriations made in this act persons in the classified service at Washington D. C., shall not be detailed for service outside of the District of Columbia except for or in connection with work pertaining directly to the service at the seat of government of the department or other Government establishment from which the detail is made: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the investigation of any matter or the preparation, prosecution, or defense of any suit by the Department of Justice.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 142, after line 15, insert as a new section the following: "That hereafter the members of the Joint Committee on Printing who are reelected to the succeeding Congress shall continue as members of said committee until their successors are chosen: *Provided*, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, on the last day of a Congress, appoint Members of their respective Houses who have been elected to the succeeding Congress to fill any vacancies which may then be about to occur on said committee, and such appointees and the members of said committee who have been reelected shall continue until their successors are chosen. The Joint Committee on Printing when Congress is not in session shall exercise all the powers and duties devolving upon said committee as provided by law the same as when Congress is in session."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this proposed new section is to give the membership of the House control of its printing during a session when the committee organizations may not have been affected. In two recent special sessions of Congress the House was at the mercy, so to speak, of the members of the Joint Committee on Printing of the Senate, and we had necessarily to go to the Senate joint committee to get any printing done for the House that was necessary. The purpose of this amendment is simply to do this. To give the Speaker of the House the same privilege that the President of the Senate now exercises and which is done under the rule of

the Senate and by a statutory enactment, viz, to continue the members of the Joint Committee on Printing of the House and Senate until their successors have been elected.

Under the present rule on the 4th of next March the membership of the Joint Committee on Printing of the House will have become officially extinct, and from that time until the Congress meets again it will be necessary for the membership of the House, if it wants to have any printing done, not only to go to the Senate members of the joint committee for it, but the sole charge of all the printing of the House will be in the keeping of these Senators as well as the direction of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This amendment simply provides that the House shall have an equal share in the say so on the printing for the Congress until the new committees are appointed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman prepared any resolution embodying the idea of the amendment proposed, and has it been submitted to the committee and adopted?

Mr. BARNHART. This resolution has passed the House twice in the printing bill, and the Senate has passed it once, conceding thereby that it is eminently fair to both bodies. The amendment merely asks for just treatment of the House in that we have charge of our own printing during vacation and when the House has no Committee on Printing.

Mr. ALMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Do I understand the members of the joint committee will be Members of the next Congress?

Mr. BARNHART. Not unless and until they are reelected as such; and it provides that the Speaker shall, as he does with the Committee on Accounts, appoint Members to service until the reorganization of the House. I admit that the resolution is subject to a point of order, but the chairman of the Committee on Printing went before the Subcommittee on Appropriations and submitted the matter, and while they hesitated about putting a legislative proposition in the bill, after conference with members of that committee and with other leaders of the House they agreed with me that it is an important matter and should here be offered. This is probably the only place we can insert it at this time, and it belongs in this bill if it can not be enacted in the printing bill, which is not likely to again come up in this short session.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I object to the gentleman violating the rule against a protest. The gentleman desires to debate a motion that is not debatable.

Mr. HENRY. I am stating a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not desire to have the gentleman state a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HENRY. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Many Members do not understand what this is all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 72, noes 36.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reports that that committee has had under consideration the bill H. R. 18542, and has come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules,

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.
The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 409 (H. Rept. 1224).

Resolved, That it shall be in order to consider an amendment to a bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, as follows, notwithstanding the general rules of the House:

"That to provide during the fiscal year 1918 for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of compensation less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees of the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the executive and judicial establishments who are appropriated for in this act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, grades, or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein": And be it further

Resolved, That no amendment shall be in order in the consideration of the foregoing amendment changing existing law beyond the fiscal year 1918, nor shall any amendment be in order relating to the compensation of employees not appropriated for in H. R. 18542.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question on the resolution. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, that gives 20 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Rules?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is entitled to 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is entitled to 20.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman from Kansas opposed to the rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the rule. I am in favor of the rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I object to the gentleman controlling the time against it.

The SPEAKER. Is any member of the Rules Committee opposed to this rule? If not, the Chair will recognize somebody that is opposed to it.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as no one seems opposed to it and the rule is very plain, I do not believe I care to discuss it at this time, and shall reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is not fair. Tell us what it means. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY. I will.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlemen suspend just half a minute? The Chair wants to know if there is anybody who wants this 20 minutes of time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I do.

Mr. MANN. That question does not arise until the gentleman from Texas takes his seat. The Chair can not recognize anybody now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows he can not recognize anybody, but the Chair wants to get this thing straight for the membership of the House and for himself.

Mr. MANN. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Under the provisions of this rule, will it be possible to make the increase apply before next July?

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman asks will it be possible to make it apply before next July?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. HENRY. No; it is only to make this amendment to section 6 in order for consideration.

Mr. MANN. The rule does not shut out amendments. The rule provides that there shall be no amendments offered beyond 1918. Now, does it also, by implication, mean that no amendment can be offered relating to a time before the fiscal year 1918?

Mr. HENRY. I do not think so. I think you can offer any amendment that is germane.

Mr. MANN. I knew you could offer any amendment that is germane.

Mr. HENRY. I think you can offer the one that the gentleman suggests.

Mr. MANN. But this rule would, as I understand it, permit an amendment which would give to the employees of the Con-

gress the same increase that is given to the employees of the President.

Mr. HENRY. I will state that we tried to make the privilege of amendment just as broad as possible under the special rule, so that all these amendments could be considered.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to express an opinion, but I should not think it very broad, with a thousand years ahead of you, if you could not offer an amendment to take effect before 1918.

Mr. HENRY. I think that sort of an amendment could be offered. The rule is plain. It means to throw open section 6 of this bill to amendment, and this amendment embraces Mr. FITZGERALD's resolution No. 406, subject to amendment; that is, amendments shall be in order for consideration. The way he originally drew the amendment was this:

Resolved, That it shall be in order to vote upon the adoption or rejection of an amendment—

To this appropriation bill. Upon the adoption or rejection of an amendment—a thing never heard of in this House before—and without meaning to disclose committee secrets, I do not believe anyone was discovered in the Committee on Rules who was willing to report that sort of a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized to control the time in opposition to the rule.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the most remarkable spectacle in my experience in this House. The chairman of the Committee on Rules, without consultation with the member in charge of the bill on the floor of the House, or with any member of the committee which reported the bill, undertook to take control of the business of the House in order to present this rule. The gentleman did not ask that a member of the committee move that the committee rise because he had a rule to present, but with that assumption of authority which has characterized his conduct since he became chairman of the Committee on Rules, supplanting that czar of whom so much complaint was formerly made, he treated with contempt the members of the committee. He presumed to take the proceedings of the House under his own control, and moved that the committee rise, to offer the pending resolution as a substitute for one proposed by me on behalf of those who prepared the legislative bill.

The Committee on Appropriations gave a good deal of consideration to the question of increasing to some extent the compensation of Government employees. There were suggestions too numerous to be mentioned in any brief compass of time. When it was realized that if the average compensation to Government employees were only \$500 per annum, a 10 per cent increase would amount to \$22,000,000, and that if the average compensation of Government employees were \$1,000, the increase would amount to \$45,000,000, it was understood that, facing a deficit of \$284,000,000, very careful consideration must be given to whatever was proposed. To precipitate a discussion to increase without even the information necessary to justify it meant that we might permanently add to the burdens of the people a sum that might easily reach \$100,000,000 a year without a single dollar of return in added service to the Government. It was in view of these circumstances that I was requested to prepare a rule which would give the House an opportunity to vote upon the simple question of whether for the period of one year there should be an increase of 10 per cent in compensations up to \$1,200 and 5 per cent from \$1,200 to \$1,800.

It was realized that whatever was done on this bill must necessarily be applied to all the employees of the Government; and realizing the magnitude of the sum involved, the committee did not wish to precipitate this question upon the House unprepared and ill-informed. Our committee itself were unable to obtain information definitely determining just how much these proposals would add to the expenditures, excepting to ascertain that on this bill it would not exceed about \$3,000,000. To prevent a riot of extravagance, I conferred with members of the Committee on Rules, including the chairman. I stated the position of the Committee on Appropriations, the difficulties surrounding the committee, the desire to do something—not perhaps what everyone would consider full justice nor to the mind of everyone would fully meet the requirements, but to do something—to meet the situation. I said that the committee, because of the situation, would prefer not to have a rule reported unless the one that was proposed should be reported, because it did not believe that in the time that would be available it would be possible in a comprehensive manner to discuss and properly consider a wholesale proposal for increases, bearing in mind our obligations to protect the Treasury. There were some intimations that I might be invited before the committee. I was

not. I received information informally that the committee would not report the proposed rule because it did not permit the Members to propose amendments to the provision; and yet the committee, saving its face by changing the rule, brings it in, restricting the amendments that may be offered but permitting amendments to be offered increasing to any extent the rates of compensation to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, other committees of this House besides the Committee on Appropriations have some responsibilities. The Committee on Rules has some obligations in theory, although in practice, since it has been created under the present system, it has not given any indication that it has knowledge of that fact. It has no right to precipitate upon this House an unbaked proposition. I do not know, and no man in this House can tell, what will be the effect of some amendments that will be proposed, and I am unwilling to vote to have considered amendments of every character which, because of the sympathy that may be aroused, because of the desire of Members to do something to alleviate the conditions of some persons who may in their opinion be insufficiently paid, may favor, although unable to determine fully, their effect.

I have heretofore referred to the fact that the estimates submitted to Congress disclose that there will be a deficit in the next fiscal year of \$284,000,000, but that does not tell all. Within an hour I have received a message from the War Department stating that in order to continue making payments to dependent families of the National Guard now stationed on the border an appropriation of \$8,500,000 additional is necessary to continue the payments from now until the 30th of next June. That is \$8,500,000 not considered in estimating the probable deficit. Other items will be submitted from time to time, of which we now have no knowledge; but it is clearly apparent that in the next fiscal year there will be a deficit in the Treasury in excess of \$300,000,000. We can not get that money from the air. There is no plant that can furnish that money. It must come from the pockets of the taxpayers of the country. We must raise between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000 in the next fiscal year, and if we do not raise it by taxation we must get it by borrowing it on the credit of the Government. To borrow it would serve no useful purpose. It would merely be a temporary expedient, and it would not give that permanent increase in revenue which is imperative. With such a situation as that in the Treasury I am unwilling to take up for consideration propositions that may increase the financial burdens of the country and the predicted deficit anywhere from \$45,000,000 to \$100,000,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have no particular joy in attempting to stop money being spent in a way that will benefit some persons in whom we are all interested. I know it is a much more pleasant task to be gracious and liberal with the public money to employees of the Government. But, Mr. Speaker, in this oasis where taxpayers seem to be unknown, some one must occasionally raise even a feeble voice in protest against the things that are proposed to increase their eternal and ever-increasing burdens. I resent the action of this Committee on Rules which is supposed to be operating for the protection of the Treasury, for the protection of the House, for the manner in which it has acted on this occasion. Perhaps it is readily explainable, when it is remembered that whatever may be the political complexion of the next House that there will be a different individual at the head of that committee.

I am opposed to this rule, and I shall vote against it. I appeal to those men who have the real interests of the Government at heart, who are not trying to play petty and picayune politics, who have some sense of their responsibility to the country, to vote down the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman from Texas yield me two minutes?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee two minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time in order to make a statement which is made necessary, so far as I am personally concerned, by the remark of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, just as he concluded his statement, to the effect that no member of the Committee on Rules was found to favor the resolution presented to the committee which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. It is not customary for gentlemen to state what occurred in the committee room—

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman from Tennessee is correct, and I wish to withdraw that statement. I had another matter in mind, and the statement was incorrect.

The SPEAKER. It is absolutely against the rule to reveal what occurred in the committee room.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the remark of the gentleman from Texas and have no objection to my action in committee room being known, and I do, in justice to myself, wish to say that I did favor the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York. After that failed, however, I was not willing as a member of the Committee on Rules to put myself in antagonism to the only resolution which the Committee on Rules seemed willing to adopt which would permit the House to consider this question of the adjustment of the salaries of Government clerks.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has cast some very severe strictures on the Committee on Rules. With his quarrel with the chairman I have no concern, but I do want to say a word concerning my view of the obligations and responsibilities of the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from New York is obviously of the opinion that when his committee, or any other committee, asks the Committee on Rules for a rule, that that committee thereupon becomes merely the adjunct of the committee, and that the Committee on Rules must report such a rule as his committee asks for, or report no rule at all.

Mr. Speaker, I have a different idea of the obligations of the committee. It is the province of the Committee on Appropriations to ask the Committee on Rules for any rule it chooses, but when it does refer a resolution to that committee its jurisdiction over that resolution is gone, and it thereupon becomes the duty of the Committee on Rules to examine that matter, to amend the rule in any way that it chooses.

Now, with reference to this rule, what did the Committee on Appropriations report this section for? Was it a play? The gentleman from New York knows full well that it must have gone out of the bill if a point of order was made to it. If the point of order was waived it was open to amendment in every way, and to wider amendment than that proposed by the Committee on Rules in this resolution.

Does the gentleman from New York contend that it was the province of his committee to determine and say that this House should accept the judgment of his committee blindly without any opportunity to consider or amend the judgment of that committee? Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules during this Democratic administration has committed many outrages on this House, but I am glad to say that up to this day it has never reported a resolution closing all right of amendment. I am glad it has not done so in this case.

The speech of the gentleman from New York implies but one thing only—that he is afraid to trust the membership of this House to act upon one thing that his committee and himself have exercised their judgment upon. But this resolution now before this House does simply that one thing. We have guarded it so that the House will exercise its judgment upon the one question that the Committee on Appropriations exercised its judgment upon, and that is a temporary increase of salaries during the fiscal year of 1918, and that it shall apply only to the employees provided for in this bill. I am amazed that any Member of this House should stand before the House and say that the membership should not have any opportunity to exercise its own judgment upon a matter reported from any committee, even the great Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.] I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the amended rule, and I am in favor of it. I voted for it because I believe that the Members of this House have the right to say whether or not they will amend a matter of great importance considered in an appropriation bill before this House. There is no matter now in the bill that has engaged so much attention as the item we are about to reach, and there is no question that it is subject to a point of order.

The object of the rule introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] was to have a vote upon that important question without debate or amendment. The Committee on Rules thought that it was of great importance that the Members of this House should have the right not only to amend it if the House saw fit, but debate it; and I am not afraid, and I hope I shall not be afraid hereafter, to submit matters of great importance to the Members of this House and let them decide whether or not they are in favor of increasing or reducing appropriations. I believe that they have at heart not only the welfare of the taxpayers, in whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has so much solicitude at this time, but also of those for whom appropriation bills are passed, and that they will balance the equities and the justice as between those

who pay and those who receive. This resolution simply saves to this House the right to say whether or not in the consideration of an important matter that matter shall be subject to amendment and debate; and I submit that even at this time a Democratic committee ought not to urge upon the Congress of the United States the adoption of a resolution that would absolutely close both amendment and debate upon a matter of very vital importance.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Why did you limit the right to amend beyond one year by this rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL. We are appropriating for one year in this bill, and we limited the amendment to matters that were absolutely germane to the bill. That was the only thing to be considered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Does the gentleman from New York wish to use any more of his time? There will be but one more speech upon our side.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not unless some one desires to speak.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain the difference between this rule and the rule proposed by the Committee on Appropriations. I have listened as best I could, but have not yet been able to understand the difference.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the rule proposed by the Committee on Appropriations did not, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has stated, preclude debate. It provided that the House should vote upon the question of adopting or rejecting the proposed increases. Debate would be in order, because there was no restriction upon it whatever.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Under what rule of the House would debate have been in order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the rules of the House which provide, first, that if an amendment is proposed in the House whoever gets the floor is entitled to an hour, and anyone else getting the floor would be entitled to an hour; while if it were proposed in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, it would be debated under the five-minute rule. Anyone sufficiently familiar with the rules to understand them would know that the proposed rule would not cut off debate, but that it left the proposition subject to debate as any other provision would be.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This was not an amendment offered upon the floor. It could not be debated under the five-minute rule, could it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, it would depend upon when it was proposed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And the rule specifically provided that it should simply be voted upon.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; it did not. I have not a copy of the rule before me, but as I drew it I know what is in it—unlike some other gentlemen. I can state it without looking at it. The rule provided that it should be in order to vote upon the adoption or rejection, as an amendment to the bill H. R. 18542 of the following provisions, which was set forth at length. Mr. Speaker, I know enough about the rules of the House to know that that did not cut off debate upon the proposition, but permitted not only discussion, but a vote upon the specific proposition whether there should be an increase of 10 per cent on compensations up to \$1,200 and 5 per cent on compensations from \$1,200 to \$1,800. The Committee on Rules, proclaiming to be anxious to preserve the sacred rights of the House to propose amendments to the provision, proposes a substitute rule expressly prohibiting as amendments provisions which would not be in order under any construction of the rules of the House. To a provision proposing to increase compensation and appropriating the money for the fiscal year, covered by the bill, no amendment extending the increase of compensation beyond that fiscal year would be in order, but the Committee on Rules thought it necessary to specifically provide that it should not be in order. It incorporated another useless provision in the rule. It prohibits the offering of any amendment that will increase the compensation of employees not affected by the appropriation bill under consideration—as if by any construction of the rules such an amendment would be in order without specific provision to make it in order.

The only thing the Committee on Rules has done is to go through the idle performance of imagining it is curtailing the rights of the House in two particulars, and by permitting it to vote upon increases in the rates of compensation to take off all restrictions. I was not surprised when I heard read the proposed rule that Members should have been under a misapprehension as to the effect of the resolution offered by myself. The only difference between those two propositions is that the Committee on Appropriations suggested that the House vote upon its specific proposition and the Committee on Rules suggests that it be open to any germane amendment, that is all, to increase or decrease the rate. That is all there is to it, and the provisos have no parliamentary effect whatever. Have I furnished my colleague with the information which he sought?

Mr. OGLESBY. Does the gentleman mean the provisos only differ, or does the gentleman mean that to permit amendments would permit them to increase the appropriations without limit?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the substitute of the Committee on Rules the rate of increase can be modified. That is the only difference.

Mr. OGLESBY. And the only modification would be to increase the amount?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nobody suspects that anyone will propose a decrease. It is merely opening wide the sluiceways of the Treasury.

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, have I any time remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Illinois wishes that time, I yield it to him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the enactment of legislation increasing the salaries of Government employees provided for in this resolution, and I may say for employees not provided for in this resolution. I regret there is no provision in the resolution by which the pay or increase would begin at once and continue for the remainder of the current fiscal year. The whole matter should be adjusted finally when the conditions are normal, which will not happen until the war in Europe closes. The rules of the House prohibit legislation on general appropriation bills, and wisely so, and should be observed, as the money must be appropriated to carry on the Government or government would stop. When legislative riders are placed on appropriation bills it is rarely well considered and is frequently vicious. The previous question has been ordered upon the resolution so it can not be amended. Under its operation immediate or early relief can not be given to meet the present emergency. Therefore, I shall vote against the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be nothing left for this side of the house to do but to vote for the rule. Everybody seems to be of the opinion that there should be some increase in salaries. The Committee on Appropriations reported section 6, which if read would go out on the point of order. If this rule is not adopted the House will have no opportunity even to vote upon any proposition with reference to increasing the rates of salaries. The resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York is not before us. This resolution is beyond the amending stage. The House has already ordered the previous question, and if we vote the resolution down, then we go ahead with the appropriation bill, section 6 will be stricken out on a point of order and there will be no opportunity to increase the salaries. If the resolution goes through the House the House will have to determine. I think it might have been just as well to have given the House a fair opportunity to vote upon the proposition submitted by the committee. That we will still have under this resolution though it will be subject to amendment, but if the resolution is defeated we have no chance to do anything at all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has five minutes remaining.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that I might escape the ordeal of receiving a lecture at the hands of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. He stated that, in his judgment, the Committee on Rules has no sense of responsibility. I think some of us have as much a sense of responsibility as the gentleman had when he left the standard of his party some years ago and went over and helped the Republicans to defeat the Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman kindly says that he drew this resolution which did not allow amendment, and which some of the members of the Rules Committee thought did not allow discussion even under the five-minute rule, in order to protect

the membership of this House against itself. In other words, the plain inference is that through their blind ignorance and groping around in this House they might hurt themselves if the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] did not draw a rule like this, which would deny them the right of amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I have not the time.

Has the time come in this country when the gentleman from New York must formulate the policy of the Committee on Appropriations and draw a rule which will deny the membership the power of amending an appropriation bill, in the simple fear that they might injure themselves? If I might venture to do so without receiving another lecture at the hands of the gentleman from New York, allow me to say I believe, if he will permit it, with the right of amendment and discussion, we will be able to consider this question and set him right where he thinks he is wrong on some phases of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some time ago, when the war in Europe came on, and the people of the South were stricken and the price of cotton went down to ruinously low levels, the gentleman from New York said it was an outrage and a shame to make it possible for a man who had produced a crop to borrow money in order that he might hold his product until the war had passed and the markets were normal. And yet in a brief period the gentleman comes and proposes an embargo against the foodstuffs that have been produced by the men who toil in the sunshine and rain, and desires to prevent the shipment of these products abroad.

Let me say, although it is digressing somewhat, as far as I am concerned, I am opposed to this proposition for two reasons. In the first place, I believe, as a congressional policy, such legislation would not be wise, and in the next place you and your constituents and others situated as you are ought to be willing to suffer a little and deprive yourselves a little bit in order that we may feed and clothe the dying and suffering and distressed of Europe. And I am against your embargo and in favor of sending clothing and food products to the starving and suffering people of Europe.

It makes a good deal of difference with the gentleman about the attitude of the Rules Committee. Let me say to him, inasmuch as he so graciously stated that I would not be chairman of the Rules Committee in the next Congress, that I never was chairman by his permission and never would have been chairman. [Applause.] But if I had chosen to return to the House of Representatives I could have come without any opposition, and I would have been chairman again even over the protest of the all-powerful chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.]

Now, why all this hue and cry about this special rule, which is plain, and just and defensible from every standpoint? It ought to be adopted. We ought to meet this question like men; and I want, in respectful tones, if I may, without incurring the displeasure of the gentleman from New York, to say that whenever the Rules Committee gets ready, as far as I am concerned, we will amend his resolution, we will bring in special rules, and we will allow the Members of this body to act and vote as they please, and to amend and freely discuss the appropriation bills, as well as all the other bills of this House.

That is all there is in the proposition, and I ask for a vote [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 190, noes 49.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 77, answered "present" 0, not voting 92, as follows:

YEAS—264.

Adair	Buchanan, Ill.	Collier	Dill
Allen	Burnett	Cooper, Ohio	Dillon
Almon	Butler	Cooper, W. Va.	Doolittle
Anderson	Caldwell	Cooper, Wis.	Dowell
Anthony	Campbell	Crago	Dunn
Ashbrook	Cantrill	Crisp	Dupré
Austin	Capstick	Crosser	Dyer
Ayres	Carlin	Curry	Eagle
Bacharach	Carter, Mass.	Dale, Vt.	Edmonds
Barchfeld	Carter, Okla.	Dallinger	Ellsworth
Barnhart	Casey	Danforth	Elston
Bennet	Chandler, N. Y.	Darrow	Emerson
Blackmon	Charles	Davenport	Esch
Bowers	Chipfield	Davis, Minn.	Evans
Britt	Church	Davis, Tex.	Fairchild
Browne	Clark, Fla.	Dempsey	Farr
Brumbaugh	Coady	Denison	Ferris

Fields	Hull, Iowa	Matthews	Smith, Mich.
Flood	Humphrey, Wash.	Mays	Smith, Minn.
Focht	Humphreys, Miss.	Meeker	Smith, Tex.
Fordney	Igoe	Miller, Del.	Snell
Foss	Jacoway	Miller, Pa.	Snyder
Poster	James	Mondell	Stafford
Freeman	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Pa.	Steagall
Fuller	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Ind.	Steele, Pa.
Gallagher	Kahn	Mott	Steenerson
Gallivan	Kearns	Mudd	Stephens, Nebr.
Gandy	Keating	Neely	Stephens, Tex.
Gard	Keister	Nelson	Sterling
Gardner	Kelley	Nicholls, S. C.	Stiness
Garland	Kennedy, Iowa	Nichols, Mich.	Stone
Garrett	Kennedy, R. I.	Nolan	Stout
Glass	Kent	North	Sulloway
Glynn	Kettner	Norton	Sweet
Good	Key, Ohio	Oakey	Switzer
Goodwin, Ark.	King	Oldfield	Tague
Gray, Ala.	Kinkaid	O'Shaunessy	Talbot
Green, Iowa	Kitchin	Overmyer	Tavener
Greene, Mass.	Konop	Padgett	Taylor, Ark.
Greene, Vt.	Lafean	Paige, Mass.	Temple
Gregg	Langley	Platt	Thomas
Guernsey	Lazaro	Porter	Thompson
Hadley	Lee	Powers	Tilson
Hamilton, Mich.	Lehlbach	Pratt	Timberlake
Hardy	Lenroot	Ragsdale	Towner
Harrison, Miss.	Lever	Raker	Treadway
Harrison, Va.	Linthicum	Ramseyer	Van Dyke
Haskell	Littlepage	Randall	Vare
Hastings	Lloyd	Reavis	Vinson
Haugen	Lobeck	Reilly	Volstead
Hawley	London	Ricketts	Walker
Hayden	McArthur	Roberts, Nev.	Walsh
Hayes	McClintic	Rodenberg	Ward
Heaton	McCulloch	Rogers	Wason
Hedlin	McDermott	Russell, Ohio	Watkins
Helgesen	McFadden	Schall	Watson, Pa.
Helvering	McGillcuddy	Scott, Mich.	Watson, Va.
Henry	McKellar	Sells	Wheeler
Hernandez	McKenzie	Shallenberger	Williams, T. S.
Hicks	McKinley	Shouse	Williams, Ohio
Hilliard	McLaughlin	Siegel	Wilson, La.
Holland	Madden	Sims	Wingo
Hollingsworth	Magee	Sinnott	Winslow
Hopwood	Mann	Sloan	Wood, Ind.
Houston	Mapes	Small	Woodyard
Hughes	Martin	Smith, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—77.

Abercrombie	Dent	Leshner	Saunders
Adamson	Dickinson	Lieber	Sears
Alexander	Dies	McAndrews	Sherley
Aswell	Dixon	Montague	Sherwood
Bailey	Doughton	Morgan, Okla.	Sisson
Barkley	Eagan	Morrison	Slayden
Black	Farley	Moss	Smith, N. Y.
Booher	Fitzgerald	Oglesby	Stedman
Borland	Gordon	Oliver	Steele, Iowa
Buchanan, Tex.	Gray, Ind.	Page, N. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hamlin	Park	Summers
Byrns, Tenn.	Helm	Quin	Taylor, Colo.
Callaway	Hood	Rainey	Tillman
Candler, Miss.	Howard	Rauch	Venable
Cannon	Huddleston	Rayburn	Webb
Caraway	Hulbert	Rouse	Williams, W. E.
Connelly	Hull, Tenn.	Rowe	Wise
Conry	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey	
Cox	Kincheloe	Rucker	
Decker	La Follette	Russell, Mo.	

NOT VOTING—92.

Aiken	Drukker	Hutchinson	Peters
Beakes	Edwards	Jones	Phelan
Beales	Estopinal	Kiess, Pa.	Pou
Bell	Fess	Kreider	Price
Benedict	Finley	Lewis	Riordan
Britten	Flynn	Liebel	Roberts, Mass.
Browning	Frear	Lindbergh	Rowland
Bruckner	Garner	Loft	Sabath
Burgess	Gillett	Longworth	Sanford
Burke	Godwin, N. C.	Loud	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Gould	McCracken	Scully
Cary	Graham	McLemore	Shackleford
Cline	Gray, N. J.	Maher	Slemp
Coleman	Griest	Miller, Minn.	Sparkman
Copley	Griffin	Moon	Sutherland
Costello	Hamill	Mooney	Swift
Cramton	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morgan, La.	Taggart
Cullop	Hart	Morin	Tinkham
Dale, N. Y.	Hensley	Murray	Whaley
Dewalt	Hill	Olney	Wilson, Fla.
Dooling	Hinds	Parker, N. J.	Wilson, Ill.
Doremus	Howell	Parker, N. Y.	Woods, Iowa
Driscoll	Husted	Patten	Young, Tex.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. BELL with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. LOUD.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. MCCracken.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. CLINE with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. FINLEY with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. SUTHERLAND.
 Mr. GARNER with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.
 Mr. HART with Mr. BEALES.
 Mr. BENEDICT with Mr. HENSLEY.
 Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. JONES.
 Mr. BROWNING with Mr. LEWIS.
 Mr. CARY with Mr. LIEBEL.
 Mr. COLEMAN with Mr. MCLEMORE.
 Mr. COPLEY with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. MURRAY.
 Mr. DRUKKER with Mr. OLNEY.
 Mr. FESS with Mr. PATTON.
 Mr. FREAR with Mr. PHELAN.
 Mr. GILLET with Mr. POU.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. PRICE.
 Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. GRAY of New Jersey with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. GRIEST with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. HAMILTON of New York with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.
 Mr. HILL with Mr. SPARKMAN.
 Mr. HINDS with Mr. STEAGALL.
 Mr. HOWELL with Mr. TAGGART.
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. WHALEY.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. WILSON of Florida.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE (H. REPT. NO. 1216, PT. 2).

Mr. NELSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. NELSON. To ask unanimous consent that any member of the Committee on the Judiciary opposed to the action of the full committee on House resolution No. 1, known as the woman-suffrage amendment, shall be permitted to file minority views not later than January 2.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that any member of the Committee on the Judiciary may file minority views on the resolution indicated at any time between now and January 2.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to say that he wanted it made January 10, although I am not sure.

Mr. NELSON. I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please state his request over again.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that any member of the Committee on the Judiciary may file minority views on House resolution No. 1 until January 10.

The SPEAKER. Until January 10?

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that any member of the Committee on the Judiciary opposed to the action taken by that committee on the woman-suffrage amendment may file minority views up to January 10. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. I merely desire, Mr. Chairman, to say that there is no objection on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LINDBERGH, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday next Wednesday, so that we can finish these appropriation bills, in order to justify the holiday recess.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business on next Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my understanding, which I think I have obtained from the gentleman, is that after the disposition of the legislative bill it is the intention to take up the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The District bill will be reported on Monday.

Mr. MANN. And that he desires to finish that bill in order to take the holiday recess on Friday.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; Friday, December 22. That is my understanding, and that is the purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record concerning the Alaska fisheries bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the Alaska fisheries bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks in the Record on the vocational education bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the vocational education bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution:

H. R. 8816. An act authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to cause the sailing vessel *Golden Gate* to be registered as a vessel of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster at Springfield, Ill., with a special canceling die for the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Illinois into the Federal Union.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 18, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18994) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings; to abolish the office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and to create and organize in the Treasury Department a Bureau of Public Buildings, and define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction; to create and establish the office of Commissioner of Public Buildings; to fix the salary and prescribe the duties and powers of the said Commissioner of Public Buildings; to create a Board of Estimates and prescribe its duties and powers; to provide for the standardization of certain classes of public buildings, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1222), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 135) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1225), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17814) to transfer Early County from the western division of the northern district of Georgia to the Albany division of the southern district of Georgia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1226), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13385) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment

in claims of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1227), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16827) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1223), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 19064) to waive the age limit and the disqualification of being married in the appointment of John J. Maher, as a second lieutenant in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 19065) aid for families of soldiers on the border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 19066) to reclassify the salaries of employees above the clerical grades in post offices of the first and second class; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 19067) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 19068) to amend an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1915; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 19069) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Crosby, State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 19070) to amend section 1496 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the examination of officers of the Navy for promotion; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19071) to amend section 44 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19072) amending section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 19073) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Shelbyville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 19074) to increase rates of pensions for permanent specific disabilities incurred while in the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 19075) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannons and balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 19076) amending the act of May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) requesting the President of the United States to discharge troops on border who were enlisted first; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 323) to amend a Senate joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce, and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee," approved July 20, 1916; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENRY: Resolution (H. Res. 408) for the consideration of H. R. 18994; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Resolution (H. Res. 410) to investigate the exorbitant price of bread in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 19077) granting an increase of pension to Emsley Caudle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19078) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Lush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 19079) for the relief of William Sheldon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 19080) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Weir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 19081) granting an increase of pension to George K. Redmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 19082) granting a pension to Mary J. Langdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 19083) granting a pension to Perry Bottles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 19084) to correct the military record of Edward Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 19085) granting a pension to Margaret Eppens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 19086) granting a pension to Sarah V. Cary Lee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 19087) for the relief of the Cudahy Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCracken: A bill (H. R. 19088) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Jennie A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19089) granting a pension to Silas D. A. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 19090) granting an increase of pension to Barbara I. Boothby, widow of David Boothby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19091) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19092) granting an increase of pension to William C. Scovell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19093) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 19094) granting an increase of pension to Enos Snodgrass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19095) granting an increase of pension to Silas M. Starkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19096) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 19097) granting an increase of pension to A. N. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 19098) granting an increase of pension to Emily W. Lothrop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19099) granting an increase of pension to Henry Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 19100) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Showers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 19101) granting an increase of pension to Anna B. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 19102) granting an increase of pension to David H. Keller, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 19103) granting a pension to Lucretia E. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19104) granting an increase of pension to Green Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 19105) granting an increase of pension to William J. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19106) granting an increase of pension to Zacariah T. Waller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19107) granting a pension to B. F. Stuteville; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19108) granting a pension to George T. Hubbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 19109) for the relief of John Kaszycki; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 19110) granting an increase of pension to Noah Hardy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19111) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Plotner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19112) for the relief of William M. Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 19113) for the relief of George B. Todd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 19114) for the relief of William W. Judd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19115) granting an increase of pension to Wilson H. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19116) granting an increase of pension to William W. Potts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19117) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Livezey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 19118) for the relief of G. A. Lieber; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Robert S. Conklin, commissioner of forestry of the State of Pennsylvania, against the Shields and Myers water-power bill, relative to the disposing of oil lands to private interests; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of employees at the United States lock and dam at Davis Island and at Lock and Dam No. 2, in the Ohio River, in support of the Nolan bill to increase their salary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of the Thread agency in re exchange charges on country checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Louis Ives, of New York City, favoring the Nolan bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of John S. Sells & Son, of New York, and the Roessler & Hasslacher Chemical Co., of New York, in re 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for increase of pension to Sarah Jane Lush, widow of William Lush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition on behalf of the Polish-American housewives of Milwaukee, Wis., in re high cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George L. Waltjin & Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., urging the passage of 1-cent drop postage, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CHARLES: Memorial of Common Council of the city of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring an embargo on food supplies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Branch 255, National Order of Letter Carriers, of Gloversville, N. Y., petitioning for increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of postal employees of Amsterdam, N. Y., for increased compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Wallace & Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring 1-cent drop postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Memorial of Rochester Branch, Railway Mail Association, relative to increased compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 110 people of Medina Baptist Missionary Society and 75 people of Medina, N. Y., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of United Bakers of Greater New York and vicinity, in re embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Brooklyn Board of Real Estate Brokers, in re navy-yard improvements for New York; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, in re pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FARR: Memorial of Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, favoring an appropriation of a sufficient amount of money for the continuance of the pneumatic-tube service in Philadelphia, Pa., for the year 1917, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of National Live Stock Shippers' Protective League, favoring a law to be enacted so as to limit the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission so as not to interfere

with the rates of intrastate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Papers to accompany House bill 7058, for relief of John S. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the removal of the Subtreasury from the city of Baltimore; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of post-office clerks and carriers of Waynesboro, Pa., favoring increase of salary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 6582, for the relief of Henry Schrawder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of mail carriers, clerks, and railway clerks, Chambersburg, Pa., favoring increase in salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOSS: Two petitions of sundry employees of the Postal Service, asking for increased wages; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 30 people of Fortnightly Club of Evanston, 122 people of Methodist Episcopal Church of Evanston, and 327 people of Evanston, Ill., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Associated Merchants of La Salle, Ill., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Congregational Missionary Society, the Methodist Episcopal Epworth League, and the Women's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, all of Sycamore, Ill., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of post-office employees of Rockford, Ill., for increase of pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of survivors of Andersonville prison, for \$2 a day for each day they were held prisoners; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER: Three petitions of clerks and carriers of the Marblehead, Gloucester, and Haverhill (Mass.) post offices, praying for an increase in salary on account of the high cost of living; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: Two petitions of citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 18475, a bill to increase pension of Joseph A. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of postal employees of San Luis Obispo, Cal., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Memorial of Commercial Club of Larimore, N. Dak., urging that legislation be adopted granting authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to settle the controversy between the railroads and their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Williamson R. Abrahamson and 47 others, favoring an increase in pay to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of 37 members of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Thompson, N. Dak., for national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 45 voters of Page and Tower City, N. Dak., favoring the adoption of a prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of National Association of Post-Office Clerks, Danbury Branch, No. 187, and petition of the carriers and clerks of the Shelton (Conn.) post office, for an increase of the rate of wages now allowed them; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of carriers and clerks of post office at Greenwich, Conn., asking for an increase in the rate of compensation allowed to carriers and clerks employed in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petitions of Mrs. Eliza Jones, San Diego, Cal.; S. W. Peel, Bentonville, Ark.; and J. H. Dolan, secretary San Francisco Camp, No. 4, San Francisco, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 655, the Keating bill, pensioning Indian war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of Mrs. Jesse A. Fox, Santa Monica; William A. Coulter, brevet major, captain, and assistant adjutant general, United States Volunteers, San Jose; Andrew Graydon, Los Angeles; George R. Clements, Gilroy; E. J. Davis, Ontario; and Henry F. Smith, San Diego, all in the State of California, favoring passage of House bill 386, Volunteer officers' retirement bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Samuel Leask, president California Retail Dry Goods Association, San Francisco.; B. D. Crinsohn, secretary Packing & Provision Co., San Francisco; E. Downing, president Hoover Spring Co., San Francisco; and B. W. McKenzie, president Western Metal Supply Co., San Diego, all in the State of California, favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, two letters from Fred A. Binney, San Diego, Cal., favoring reduced postage rate on manuscripts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Paul Scharrenberg, secretary-treasurer California State Federation of Labor, San Francisco; Mrs. Henry Goodell, president San Bernardino Women's Club, San Bernardino; and R. G. Brodrick, superintendent City and County Hospital, San Francisco, all in the State of California, favoring passage of House bill 11864, the Kent bill, providing for Federal aid for indigent tuberculosis patients; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of 405 residents of San Bernardino; O. A. Tveitmo, secretary Building Trades Temple, San Francisco; William T. Nelson, San Bernardino; and W. F. Burgener, National City, all in the State of California, protesting against high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of William S. Davenport, San Diego, and A. Gunther, secretary Trades and Labor Council, Vallejo, both in the State of California, favoring legislation prohibiting export of goods to warring nations, which we make in amounts sufficient to supply needs of this country, and at less prices than are charged at home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of John D. Benton, San Diego, Cal., favoring the introduction of a board of arbitration to dispose of questions between railroads and their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of George H. Reid, secretary, Mecca, Cal., favoring prohibition—the Hobson amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John B. Elliott, United States Customs Service, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring increase in penalty for opium smuggling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Paul Scharrenberg, San Francisco, Cal., favoring retirement of civil-service employees; establishment of a civil-service court of appeals, or trial board; employment of sufficient number of subclerks to relieve post-office clerks; House bill 12029, the Alaska salmon-fishing industry; protection of fishermen; establishment of Government hospital ship in Bering Sea for care of sick and injured fishermen; establishment of Government hospital in Bristol Bay region of Alaska for fishermen; and protesting against increased cost of white paper; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of A. B. Hastings, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring House bill 15096, relating to lieu lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Mrs. Nelle P. Johns, San Diego, Cal., favoring Penrose-Griffin retirement bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Julian Pierce, San Diego, Cal., favoring Stevens bill, House bill 13305; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING: Petition signed by C. W. Hollandsworth and divers employees of the Canton (Ill.) post office, asking an increase of their pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution signed by Rev. J. T. Pierce, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Abingdon, Ill., favoring a national prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution signed by Rev. A. M. Hale, pastor of the Christian Church of Abingdon, Ill., favoring a national prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition signed by E. A. Simpson and divers employees of the Quincy (Ill.) post office, asking for an increase of their pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition signed by Lloyd A. Eby and divers employees of the Kewanee (Ill.) post office, asking an increase of their pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions signed by James E. Marks, secretary of the Order of the United Commercial Travelers of America, Council No. 269, of Galesburg, Ill., asking that a reduction be made in the present charge of handling the ordinary letter from a 2-cent to a 1-cent rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Jabez B. Workman and 11 other postal employees, praying an increase in pay because of the

high cost of living; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: Petition of Railway Mail Clerks' Association, favoring increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Two petitions of postal employees of Dixon and Freeport, Ill., for increase of salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of postal employees of Watertown, Lowville, Fulton, Adams, and Carthage, N. Y., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NORTH: Petitions of Local Union, United Mine Workers of America, located at Brockwayville; Local Union No. 480, United Mine Workers of America, located at Chambersville; and Local Union No. 1798, United Mine Workers of America, located at Ramsaytown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, representing 490 members, praying for the appointment of a commission to proceed to devise ways and means to restore the food prices back to something near normal; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Petition of John E. Ney-alley and 14 employees of the Chilton (Mass.) post office, for increased pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Women's Christian Temperance Union of Prattburg, N. Y., Mrs. C. M. Van Valkenburgh, president; Nettie Marrila Smith, secretary; and Frank H. Bisbee, pastor Presbyterian Church; George A. Orton, pastor Baptist Church; and E. W. Collings, pastor Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring national and District of Columbia prohibition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Arthur B. McLeod, president, Le Valley, McLeod, Kinkaid Co., of Elmira, N. Y., favoring a 1-cent, drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William J. Davis, president Davis-Brown Electric Co., Ithaca, N. Y., favoring a 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of the Theed Agency, of New York, in re exchange charges on country checks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS: Two petitions of employees of the Andover (Mass.) post office, and the Reading post office, for an increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of B. J. Blanchard and 19 citizens of Albion, Mich., favoring increase in pay to mail clerks, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of Business Men's Association of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring the improvement of the Pawtucket River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of Tri-City Federation of Labor, Rock Island, Ill., favoring embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Miss May Wood and 50 other citizens of Tabor, Iowa, praying for the enactment of a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the members of the United Presbyterian Church, the members of the First Baptist Church, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Allerton, Iowa, favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of railway clerks, postal clerks, letter carriers, and rural-delivery carriers, for increased pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of 120 citizens of Medford, Mass., in behalf of an embargo on coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

MONDAY, December 18, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we lift our hearts to Thee and pray for the passion of eternity. In the pressing duties of our daily life and the output of our energies to solve the problems of life we are lured from a contemplation of the things that make for our eternal life. We pray that the appetite of spirit, starved small by the stern necessities of this life, may not be satisfied with the pleasures and with the honors of this world only, but give to us a desire to measure up to God's supreme conception of manhood. May we follow after Him who embodied the fullness of all life and at last attain unto the perfect measure of human life. Bless us in the discharge of the duties of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND, duly elected to the office of United States Senator for the term ending March 3, 1923, which I ask may be received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN.

Certificate of election.

We, the undersigned, State canvassers, from an examination of the election returns received by the secretary of state, determine that, at the general election held on the 7th day of November, 1916, CHARLES E. TOWNSEND was duly elected to the office of United States Senator for the term ending March 3, 1923.

In witness whereof, we have hereto subscribed our names at Lansing, this 12th day of December, 1916.

COLEMAN C. VAUGHAN,
Secretary of State.
JOHN W. HAARER,
State Treasurer.
FRED L. KEELER,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

BOARD OF STATE CANVASSERS.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Department of State, ss:

I hereby certify that the foregoing copy of the certificate of determination of the board of State canvassers is a correct transcript of the original of such certificate of determination on file in this office.

In witness whereof I have hereto attached my signature and the great seal of the State at Lansing this 12th day of December, 1916.

COLEMAN C. VAUGHAN,
Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE.

Mr. SHIELDS. I present the credentials of KENNETH D. McKELLAR, chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from that State for the term of six years, beginning the 4th day of March, 1917, which I ask may be received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, KENNETH D. McKELLAR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, Tom C. Rye, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1916.

[SEAL.]

TOM C. RYE, Governor.

By the governor:

R. R. SNEED, Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8092) confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, and Mr. CAMPBELL managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (No. 324) authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1916, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HARDING presented a petition of the City Council of Toledo, Ohio, praying for an investigation into the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Civil Service Employees, of Dayton, Ohio, praying for an increase in the salaries of all Government employees, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota presented a memorial of the Retail Merchants' Association of Pierre, S. Dak., remonstrating against any further extension of the parcel post system and favoring the adoption of a 1-cent letter postage, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Ship Painters' Union of East Boston, Mass., praying for the placing of an embargo on food products, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Boston and Leicester, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national